

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 187. Resolution relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 188. Resolution to authorize the transfer of naval vessels; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 189. Resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, requesting the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, being a concurrent resolution of the house and senate of said legislature, memorializing the United States Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3649. A bill for the relief of Mir Kazem Kashani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 3650. A bill for the relief of Khodrahm Sourshian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 3651. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 3652. A bill for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 3653. A bill for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

201. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Passaic Valley Methodist Parish advocating crime commissions and other efforts to uphold community morality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. Also letter from the Social Action Committee of the Packanack Community Church, Packanack Lake, N. J., commending the Senate Crime Investigation Committee on its splendid work and urging support of its recommendations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Resolution passed by the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress and the CAA to reinstate its flight rules governing LaGuardia Field and Idlewild Airport; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

204. Also, resolution passed by the New York State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to retain local

offices of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

205. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of Indiana Division of the Travelers Protective Association of America, opposing any further increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

206. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of Shamrock Club of Columbus, Ohio, and others, supporting resolutions for a United Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Grant us the grace to be valiant pilgrims on life's dusty and dreary way. Deliver us from unlovely self-conceit, so that we may not think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think. Make us forgiving and forbearing. Teach us to toil and ask not for reward save that of knowing we do the things that please Thee.

As we turn to our waiting tasks, may the love of friends, the confidence of those who believe in us, the spur of conscience and the commanding call of goodness be the guiding stars to lead us on. Strengthen our will to choose always that which is morally excellent, rather than that which is politically expedient. So that, having received the inheritance of heroic yesterdays, we may transmit it unsullied and unwasted to a brighter tomorrow. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 9, 1951, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2612. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District;

H. R. 3196. An act to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as

Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3587. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KILGORE, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1951, RELATING TO RFC—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 9th instant,

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported on April 10, 1951, the resolution (S. Res. 76) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and submitted a report (No. 213) thereon.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate has agreed immediately to proceed with the call of the calendar of unobjectioned bills, beginning at the beginning.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe more Members should be on the floor. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hendrickson	Neely
Bricker	Hennings	Nixon
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Butler, Md.	Hill	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Robertson
Capehart	Ives	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Taft
Duff	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Lodge	Tobey
Eastland	McCarran	Underwood
Eaton	McCarthy	Watkins
Ellender	McFarland	Welker
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Frear	Maybank	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Young
George	Monroney	
Gillette		

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOBY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is absent on official business attending the sessions of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

#### REPLACEMENT OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority leader to yield to the minority leader long enough so that I may ask unanimous consent of the Senate to submit a concurrent resolution at the conclusion of some brief remarks which I should like to make, having to do with General MacArthur.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Does the Senator wish to submit a resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to submit a resolution and to say a few words about it.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Reserving the right to object—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona does not have the floor, and therefore cannot yield it. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska in his own right.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A resolution of any kind can be submitted only by unanimous consent. Under the rule governing debate while the calendar is being called, Senators are limited to 5 minutes on any bill, unless they obtain unanimous consent to speak for a longer time.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Reserving the right to object, assuming that a unanimous-consent request is to be made, I told the distinguished minority leader that I thought this was a courtesy which I would like to extend to him as minority leader, so as to enable him to submit his resolution and make a brief statement. I do not wish it to be considered as a precedent, or as indicating that I would agree to any further similar unanimous-consent requests; but I feel that the minority leader is in a little different category, in that he is speaking for his side of the aisle. For that reason I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Nebraska asking unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and briefly to discuss it. I shall not exceed 10 minutes. I wished to submit that request prior to the call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 10 minutes, and at the end of that time to submit a resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hope the minority leader is not going into the discussion of this subject at this particular time. I think this is a matter we should think over and pray over before we go into it.

Probably the minority leader feels as I feel. I served under General MacArthur in the First World War, and I placed him on a pedestal, so to speak. Anything that is done to him hurts me. I hope that we will not rush headlong into this subject without giving it a great deal of time and study before we talk too much about it. It is a vital matter. Probably the people of Japan are considering the subject and cannot understand what has just happened. They worship MacArthur. There is no question about that. There being so much involved, I hope that the Senate will not be immediately thrown into a discussion of the subject without giving it a great deal of thought.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader, and also other Members of the Senate, for the opportunity to make a few brief observations about the concurrent resolution which I shall ask unanimous consent to submit at the conclusion of my brief remarks.

I deeply appreciate the admonition of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. Anything that is done after the tragic events of the early morning should be thought out clearly. Certainly the concurrent resolution which is to be submitted is the result of careful consideration. I could not help but think of the words uttered by our Chaplain in the prayer today, when he praised the heroic deeds of yesterday, the deeds of men who died for the United States and for the peace of the world.

However, while I was thinking about that I thought about the telephone call which I received at 1:10 this morning, informing me about what I think is a tragic mistake on the part of the administration. So while we praise the heroic deeds of those who have died for their country, I think it is well constructively to criticize and to offer suggestions as to the tragic mistakes which have been made in the past few hours, involving the resignation, discharge, or whatever one may choose to call it, of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. President, I send the concurrent resolution to the desk and ask that it be read. It is self-explanatory. I think the distinguished Senator from South Carolina will agree that it comes within the confines of his admonition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) was read, as follows:

Whereas the action of the President in summarily relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of his commands as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief, United Nations Commands; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East; has precipitated a situation fraught with danger to the national defense and has struck a blow to the national unity that is so vital in these perilous times; and

Whereas General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has had a long and distinguished career in the Pacific in the service of our country, and possesses unsurpassed knowledge of political and military conditions in Korea and Asia generally that would be helpful to the Congress in determining a sound national-defense policy for the unified support of all Americans: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That General of the Army Douglas MacArthur be hereby invited to present his views and recommendations for policies and courses in Korea and Asia generally to a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. This invitation shall be extended forthwith to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in a jointly signed communication, and that the majority and minority floor leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives make the arrangements necessary for the convening of such a joint session to be held at the convenience of General of the Army MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution is self-explanatory. It carries only an invitation by the leadership to General MacArthur to come home and make his report to the Congress before a joint session of the Congress. The Congress being the representatives of the people, General MacArthur would speak not only to the Congress but to the American people relative to his recommendations and observations with respect to foreign policy and military affairs in the Far East.

Mr. President, in all sincerity, I feel that General MacArthur is entitled to his day in court. Certainly the tribute paid to him by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is a basis upon which we all should join in asking that he may be extended an invitation to come back to the United States, submit a detailed report of his observations, and to make recommendations as to what policies, military policies as well as foreign policies, should, in his opinion, be followed in the Pacific and in other parts of the world.

As everyone knows, General MacArthur has an enviable record. Somehow the people of the United States feel that the one bright spot in our foreign policy in the Pacific is represented by what General MacArthur has done. Regardless of what we think about him personally, I am satisfied the American people are vitally interested in the invitation the resolution extends to him.

General MacArthur has superior knowledge. There can be no doubt about that. I feel personally that he has knowledge that no other living American has relative to the policies we should pursue in the Far East. We have been unable to obtain his advice.



I joined with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and, as I recall, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in making such a request as is contained in the resolution. I am not sure as to the position of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] at that time, but I think he and the entire Appropriations Committee 2 years ago joined in asking that General MacArthur be brought back home in order that we might have the benefit of his counsel and advice. At that time, because of protocol, and the existing situation, the answer was that he would have to be ordered back because, as the military commander in the Far East area, he was needed at his post, and should not leave it long enough to come back to the United States and make a report.

But today, Mr. President, he has been relieved of that command, and he can take the time to return to the United States and make a report to the American people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Nebraska that this morning, although it is now only a little after 9 o'clock in my State, I have received more than 400 telegrams from Californians, two of them supporting the action of the President of the United States and 400 of them vigorously disapproving the action the President has taken.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I must hasten because of limitation of time.

I should like to say for the record that since 1:20 o'clock this morning I have received more telephone calls than in any similar length of time in my life. They have come to me from all sections of the United States, asking that General MacArthur be brought home, so he may express his views and observations to the American people. Certainly that is only fair. Regardless of what he might say, and regardless of opinions which may be held about General MacArthur, he certainly should have his day in court. I know the American people will be glad to listen to his advice and the admonitions he may give to the Congress of the United States and to them. I think the time has come when that opportunity should be afforded. Certainly we owe it to General MacArthur and we owe it to the people of the United States that what the resolution proposes should be done. Now that he has been relieved of his command, I am quite satisfied that the American people would like to know what General MacArthur actually feels may happen in the future and what should be done.

There are those who may say, "Well, he will not come," or, "We have made such a request before and he would not come." I desire to announce to my colleagues that a telephone call was made to General MacArthur within a few minutes before I came on the floor of the Senate at noon. I will be perfectly

frank to say that the one who spoke with General MacArthur was the minority leader of the House of Representatives, Hon. JOSEPH MARTIN. The telephone call was made in my presence, and Representative MARTIN authorized me to say that General MacArthur stated to him that he would be glad to accept the invitation to come back to the United States; that he considered it not only to be a privilege, but that he would consider it an honor to express his views to a joint session of Congress. So that ought to end, once and for all, argument and speculation over whether or not General MacArthur would accept an invitation if it were extended to him. I have been asked officially to say that in behalf of General MacArthur and also of the minority leader of the House of Representatives, Hon. JOSEPH MARTIN.

Mr. President, there is only one more thing I should like to say. How much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has just about expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I close with this admonition: Before we can determine the defense policy and what appropriations should be made for the Military Establishment, it is absolutely necessary that a constructive national defense policy be formulated. We need the advice and the counsel not only of our military commanders here, but of anyone from whom we can get it, who can give us intelligent advice as to the course we should pursue. It is for that reason that I should like to have General MacArthur come before the Congress, so he could help at least one member of the Appropriations Committee in determining the division of appropriations which should be made with respect to our defense policy; what we should spend in the Pacific, what we should spend in Europe, not only in dollars, but in manpower.

I ask now that the resolution be permitted to lie on the table, because I expect after the call of the calendar to ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the resolution lying on the table?

Mr. McFARLAND. I object to that, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona objects.

Mr. WHERRY. What will be the disposition then of the concurrent resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over under the rule.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR TRUST TERRITORY OF PACIFIC ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a civil government for the Trust Ter-

ritory of the Pacific Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### EDUCATION OF DEPENDENT MINOR CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES STATIONED OVERSEAS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the education of the dependent minor children of the military and civilian personnel of the Federal Government stationed overseas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### REPORT OF YUGOSLAV EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report regarding the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, for the period October 20, 1950, through March 15, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### RESCUE OF LOST CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WHILE IN PERFORMANCE OF OFFICIAL DUTIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the rescue of civilian employees of the Federal Government who are lost in the performance of their official duties, to continue salary payments of such employees, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TO CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the benefits of the Social Security Act to certain employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

#### ANNUAL- AND SICK-LEAVE PRIVILEGES TO CERTAIN INDEFINITE SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN POSTAL SERVICE

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, as amended, to grant annual- and sick-leave privileges to certain indefinite substitute employees in the postal service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### REPEAL OF CERTAIN LEGISLATION RELATING TO GALLUP-DURANGO HIGHWAY AND GALLUP-WINDOW ROCK HIGHWAY, NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPEAL OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO TIMBER AND STONE ON PUBLIC DOMAIN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the programs and activities of the Commission for the period July 1 through December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CLAIMS OF THE WESTERN (OLD SETTLER) CHEROKEE INDIANS, EX REL. DOROTHEA OWEN ET AL., AND THE EASTERN (EMIGRANT) CHEROKEE INDIANS, EX REL. JESSE B. MILAM ET AL., v. UNITED STATES

Two letters from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the findings of fact, conclusions of law and judgment, and opinion of the Commission in the cases of *The Western (Old Settler) Cherokee Indians, ex rel. Dorothea Owen et al.*, and *The Eastern (Emigrant) Cherokee Indians, ex rel. Jesse B. Milam et al. v. The United States* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Finance:

##### "Resolution 121

"Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly to memorialize the Congress of the United States to retain local offices of the Veterans' Administration

"Whereas experience has proven that the local offices now maintained by the Veterans' Administration in the various communities throughout the State have rendered beneficial service; and

"Whereas, because of the accessibility of these offices, veterans have had better opportunity to use their facilities without the undue hardship that would of necessity be entailed by having to travel to congested areas in the large cities; and

"Whereas press releases indicate that the Veterans' Administration contemplates the closing of these local offices and will maintain contact offices only in the large cities of the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to direct the Veterans' Administration to retain the local offices now operated by the administration, in the interest of fairness to the veterans; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York.

"By order of the assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI, Clerk.

"In senate, March 16, 1951, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the senate.

"WILLIAM S. KING, Secretary."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

##### "Assembly Joint Resolution 24

"Joint resolution relative to assistance in continuing availability of trained manpower in agricultural aviation

"Whereas the use of aviation for conducting agricultural operations in the State of California has become an integral part of food and fiber production; and

"Whereas agricultural pest-control material was applied to 200,000 acres in California in 1946 and by 1949 such operations had been expanded to cover 2,100,000 acres; and

"Whereas there have been other extensive agricultural operations carried on by aircraft, such as seeding, fertilizing, and defoliating during this same period; and

"Whereas the requirements for increased agricultural production occasioned by the

present international situation plus the lifting of acreage restrictions on important California crops indicate that there will be more than 5,000,000 acres of land in California which will be planted, fertilized, defoliated, or treated for control of pests in 1951; and

"Whereas this tremendous volume of agricultural aviation activity is accomplished through the efforts of approximately 300 to 350 pilots and 175 to 225 mechanics, both groups requiring special training and experience in the operation and maintenance of aircraft, and for this purpose, and in the peculiar nature of the operations; and

"Whereas approximately 90 percent of these pilots and approximately 70 percent of these mechanics, who are key personnel in continuing the important work of agricultural aviation, are subject to call to active duty with the armed services, either as members of Reserve components or by induction through selective-service procedures; and

"Whereas recall to active duty or induction into the armed services of any of these key personnel, small in number in relation to the total manpower requirements of the services, but large in number in relation to the volume of production affected by their operations, will drastically hamper and eventually cripple vital agricultural services at a time when this Nation and the world require the absolute maximum production of foods and fiber: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to seriously consider delaying a call for immediate service in the Armed Forces of those persons now employed as pilots and trained mechanics in operation of aircraft for agricultural uses until adequate replacements may be procured and trained; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretaries of Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, Agriculture, and Labor, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, and to the Director of the Selective Service System."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

##### "Assembly Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution relative to continuing the 27½ percent depletion rate for oil producing properties in the Internal Revenue Code

"Whereas committees of the Congress are considering a reduction of the 27½ percent yearly depletion rate allowed for income from oil producing properties as provided by the Internal Revenue Code, section 114 (b) (3); and

"Whereas any reduction would decrease incentive for oil exploration, reduce reserves at time of emergency, cause shut down of marginal wells with a consequent irrecoverable loss of oil, and cripple the program for expanded emergency production; and

"Whereas a percentage depletion is the only just method of avoiding a tax on return of capital which is expended on experimental drilling (60 percent of which proves unprofitable); and

"Whereas the present income tax laws penalize a taxpayer who produces oil from a well, in that tax advantages would result if he sold the well immediately after discovery, or held it for over 6 months, the tax on the gains being respectively limited to 30 percent and 25 percent; and

"Whereas the percentage depletion of 27½ percent does not fully make up for this vice; and

"Whereas the depletion over the years can never exceed the actual amount of capital expended by a taxpayer; and

"Whereas the oil industry accounts for 3 percent of the national income but produces 7 percent of all taxes, and any reduction in depletion allowances would further burden an industry paying more than its portion to taxes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to refrain from any action which would reduce the present depletion allowance on oil producing properties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

##### "House Memorial 43

"To the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in twentieth session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the United States Army engineers have approved some ten or twelve harbor projects in Alaska during the past several years; and

"Whereas these harbor projects have not been completed because of the lack of sufficient appropriations; and

"Whereas many of these harbors are fast becoming overcrowded by our fishing fleets; and

"Whereas this harbor-improvement program has a direct bearing on the defense program not only as it affects food production but also because the improved harbor facilities would not only provide sufficient safe anchorage for fishing vessels but would also provide good and adequate harbors for the many Government vessels in Alaskan waters;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that Congress make a sufficient appropriation to complete those harbor projects which have already been approved for Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, March 13 1951.

"WILLIAM A. EGAN,  
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET O. GRISHAM,  
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Approved by the Governor, March 16, 1951.

"ERNEST GRUENING,  
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the Senate of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

##### "Senate Memorial 6

"To the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Senate of the Territory of Alaska in legislative session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the economic security and development of the Territory of Alaska are essential to the defense of the Territory; and

"Whereas such security and development are contingent upon a permanent population



induced through adequate housing facilities; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has made funds available through the facilities of the Federal Housing Administration; and

"Whereas such funds have been computed on a cost differential of 33 1/4 percent in excess of costs for comparable housing facilities in stateside localities; and

"Whereas such differential is insufficient to compensate for actual building costs in Alaska because of advanced prices of materials, greater shipping distances, multiple handling charges, and higher wages; and

"Whereas \$11,000,000 is now available for commitment to rental housing construction and cannot attract sponsors because of the discrepancy between actual costs and allowed differential; and

"Whereas a limited time remains to induce housing construction because of climatic limitations in Alaska:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Senate of the twentieth regular session of the Alaska Legislature, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States enact immediate, appropriate legislation to provide a 50-percent differential over stateside construction costs for projects approved by the Federal Housing Administration in Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "House Joint Memorial 12

*"To the Congress of the United States and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"Your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent:

"Whereas Alaska remains practically undeveloped notwithstanding that it contains many great natural resources, such as timber, water power, oil, iron, and divers other valuable and usable minerals, most of which lie unused and dormant; and

"Whereas the development of these natural resources is both necessary and desirable to augment the national economy and defense of the United States, and more particularly the economy and, hence, the defense of Alaska; and

"Whereas the natural resources of Alaska are especially required now to implement the new and present war effort; and

"Whereas the risks of doing business in a noncontiguous area of the United States such as Alaska are much greater than in the continental United States itself because of lack of population, labor pools, community and service facilities, and diversified means of transportation, and because of frequent maritime work stoppages, higher costs of construction and of labor and transportation; and

"Whereas the comparative lack of security of investments in high risk areas such as Alaska tends to discourage the investment of large amounts of private capital in new industrial enterprises located therein, which large amounts of private capital are necessary for the development of Alaska's natural resources; and

"Whereas the investment of such private capital by corporations could be induced by excluding from such a corporation's gross income, as defined in section 22 of the Internal Revenue Code (U. S. C.), all income derived from the active conduct of a trade or business in the Territory, for a period of 15 years from and after the first fiscal year of operation, or for such shorter period as that during which the total amount of Federal income taxes which would otherwise have been paid by such corporation, by rea-

son of its operation of such trade or business in Alaska, shall be equal to the capital invested in such trade or business, but in no event beyond December 31, 1975; provided, such corporation engages or is engaged in a trade or business producing, processing, or manufacturing in Alaska a natural resource, or products thereof, not produced, processed, or manufactured in the Territory of Alaska in substantial commercial quantities during the calendar year 1949, regardless of whether or not such corporation may produce, process, or manufacture other natural resources or products thereof which have heretofore been produced, processed, or manufactured in Alaska; provided, further, only that part of such corporation's gross income as is attributable to the producing, processing or manufacturing of natural resources or their products as herein heretofore defined shall be subject to such exclusion or exemption:

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to promptly enact, and the Honorable Delegate to Congress from Alaska to seek the prompt enactment by Congress of, legislation exempting, in accordance herewith, corporate gross income from Federal income tax to induce the investment of the necessary large private capital required to develop the natural resources of Alaska.

"And your memorialists will ever pray."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

#### "House Memorial 35

*"To the Congress of the United States; to the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, by an act approved May 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 170), as amended provided a program of Federal aid for public airport development in the States and Territories; and

"Whereas, pursuant thereto, a 3-to-1 matching formula is now available to the Territory of Alaska for the construction of public airports; and

"Whereas said favorable matching ratio will, by terms of applicable law and regulations thereunder, be scaled downward commencing July 1, 1952, with resultant decreased Federal participation, dollarwise, to territorial participation, in the cost of constructing public airports in Alaska; and

"Whereas Alaska is dependent on air transportation in degree far surpassing any other State or Territory of the United States; and

"Whereas the defense and development of Alaska are intimately linked with its aviation facilities; and

"Whereas an accelerated airport construction program in Alaska is essential to the defense of the United States;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the house of representatives of the Territorial legislature, in twentieth regular session assembled, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States appropriate and allot for matching purposes under existing provisions of the Federal Airport Act and its derivative regulations \$1,000,000 for obligation prior to July 1, 1952, for public airports in Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, March 13, 1951.

"WM. A. EGAN,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET O. GRISHAM,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Approved by the Governor March 15, 1951.

"ERNEST GRUENING,

"Governor of Alaska."

Two resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "House Memorial 48

*"To the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate in Congress from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in twentieth session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the Alaska Native Service and its predecessor agencies within the Department of the Interior have been operating in Alaska since before the time of Alaska's organization as an incorporated Territory of the United States; and

"Whereas the Alaska Native Service has built up a staff of Federal employees running into the hundreds whose salaries and expenses constitute a heavy drain upon the Federal Treasury, including the portion thereof derived from Alaska taxpayers; and

"Whereas the condition of the native residents of Alaska—Eskimo, Indian, and Aleut—has, despite these expenditures, shown no material improvement throughout the period the Alaska Native Service and its predecessor agencies have been operating, but on the contrary has steadily declined; and

"Whereas the policies and activities of the Alaska Native Service appear to be directed more toward the growth and perpetuation of a Federal bureaucracy than the improvement of the condition of Alaska's native people; and

"Whereas the really useful function which the Alaska Native Service could provide of furnishing educational facilities for Alaska's native residents is being progressively abdicated by that agency as is illustrated by the failure ever to provide schooling for thousands of native children living in remote sections of Alaska, and by the Alaska Native Service's abandoning more than 30 Indian schools over the past few years and throwing the burden of educating the affected children without warning on the Territorial government; and

"Whereas, despite this withdrawal from its responsibilities, the Alaska Native Service has been spending more and more millions of dollars every year; and

"Whereas the large amount of Federal funds now going to pay the salaries and overhead of the numerous employees of the Alaska Native Service could achieve real results if it reached the native residents of Alaska instead of going to the aforesaid Federal bureaucrats:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the Alaska Native Service be abolished and that Federal funds in sums consistent with what has heretofore been spent to maintain that agency be turned over annually by the Federal Government to the Territorial treasury for use in improving the condition of Alaska's native residents and placing them on a plane of absolute and actual equality with the rest of the citizens of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

#### "House Memorial 50

*"To the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in twentieth regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas, the public-welfare laws of the Territory of Alaska, in providing for general relief for indigent and destitute residents of the Territory, prohibit the granting of any relief to Indian or Eskimo residents of the

Territory who are provided for by the Department of the Interior out of the funds of the Treasury of the United States; and

"Whereas, out of funds presently appropriated by Congress for the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the United States, certain amounts are allotted by such Bureau to the Alaska Native Service for the purposes of providing general relief for the needy Indians and Eskimos of the Territory; and

"Whereas the amounts of such funds made available to the Alaska Native Service are completely inadequate to meet the needs of the destitute and indigent Indians and Eskimos of the Territory, and are, in fact, so small that they will not even provide relief for such persons at a much lower standard than that presently existing under the Territorial public welfare laws applicable to the white residents of the Territory; and

"Whereas many poverty-stricken Indians and Eskimos of the Territory are suffering great privation because of a lack of funds to provide them even the bare necessities of life;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that Congress immediately appropriate for the use of the Alaska Native Service funds in an amount sufficient to meet the desperate needs of the indigent and destitute Indians and Eskimos in the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

#### "Senate Joint Memorial 7

"To the Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN, President of the United States; to the Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization; to the Honorable W. STUART SYMINGTON, Chairman of the National Security and Resources Board; to the Honorable OSCAR CHAPMAN, Secretary of the Interior; to the President of the Senate and the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES; and to the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate to Congress for the Territory of Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in twentieth regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the United States has a critical need for certain strategic minerals to be used in the defense of our country; and

"Whereas many of these minerals are known to exist in the Second Division of Alaska, principally on Seward Peninsula and in the Kobuk and Noatak Basins; and

"Whereas these mineral resources are lying undeveloped due to a lack of interest and positive action on the part of the Washington offices of the National Security Resources Board and Defense Minerals Administration who have it in their power to assist in procuring the necessary development, capital, and ore sales guarantees; and

"Whereas the Washington officials of the two above-named agencies offer as their only objection that the Second Division of Alaska is indefensible should an attack come from the west;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in twentieth regular session assembled, respectfully states (1) that the Seward Peninsula and adjacent areas are rich in natural resources and the ores of tin, tungsten, beryllium, fluorite, asbestos, antimony, and graphite, are known to exist in economically mineable quantities, and deposits of uranium ore have been reported in the area; (2) that Lieutenant General Kepner, commander in chief of the Alaska theater, has publicly stated that this region with its wealth of natural resources, can and will be defended by his military forces in case of attack; (3) that

water power sites necessary to supply cheap power for mining, milling, and processing of these ores are known to exist in the Fish River, Salmon Lake area, Tuksuk Channel near Teller, Kobuk and Noatak Rivers; and

"Therefore your memorialist respectfully urges the Senate of the United States to re-open the case for the development of these sources of strategic minerals by means of a directive to the National Security and Resources Board and Defense Minerals Administration, and to direct the Department of Interior to immediately investigate these mineral resources and look into building water power sites to supply electricity to the citizens of the second division of Alaska to develop these mineral resources and for such other purposes as may be required.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

#### "House Joint Memorial 11

"To the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate From Alaska to Congress:

"Your memorialist, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent:

"Whereas every encouragement should be given to prospective settlers and investors to settle in and to develop the natural resources of Alaska; and

"Whereas every cloud on title to lands should be removed without delay; and

"Whereas the question of Indian or aboriginal title constitutes such a cloud on title to lands desired by homesteaders, traders, and manufacturers, and pulp, paper, and other prospective investors; and

"Whereas economic and industrial progress and development of Alaska as a whole, and of the coastal areas in particular, are being retarded and hampered by the uncertainties of the Indian or aboriginal title controversy;

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to investigate, and to settle equitably to all parties in interest and to the general welfare of the Territory, the question of Indian or aboriginal title to all lands in the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialists will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 27, 1951.

"WM. A. EGAN,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET O. GRISHAM,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate March 15, 1951.

"GUNNARD M. ENGBERETH,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"BONNIE JO GRONROOS,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved by the Governor March 16, 1951.

"ERNEST GRUENING,

"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

#### "House Memorial 38

"To the President and the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Corps of Engineers, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas Gastineau Channel lies between the mainland of southeast Alaska and the eastern and northern shores of Douglas Island, and the northernmost part of said channel, between Salmon Creek and Mendenhall Peninsula, has become so filled with glacial silt that it can be navigated only by small craft at high tide; and

"Whereas, because Gastineau Channel is limited to navigation as foresaid, almost all fishing and other commercial vessels, pleasure boats, and vessels of the Government of the United States, operating between Juneau and Douglas and all points to the north and west thereof must now navigate around Douglas Island, through Stevens Passage, thereby adding approximately 20 miles to each voyage of said vessels and subjecting them to the high winds and seas sometimes encountered in Stephens Passage off Taku Inlet; and

"Whereas the need for such a navigable channel has been recognized since the Chief of Engineers on February 24, 1928, directed that a survey thereof be made; and, the need, feasibility, and practicability of such a channel were recognized in the District Engineer's report of May 24, 1928, wherein it was recommended that a 75-foot channel be dredged to M. L. L. W.; and, the merits of the improvement have been recognized by the 1941 report thereon which was approved by the Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers and submitted to Congress in House Document No. 325, Seventy-seventh Congress; and

"Whereas improvements to the Juneau Airport recommended by a Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Service Committee would be materially enhanced by the proposed channel improvements, and it is likely that the spoil from the dredging could be used in the adjacent airport improvements: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in twentieth regular session assembled, That the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget, (a) reconsider the priority rating on dredging Gastineau Channel, and (b) that sufficient funds be appropriated immediately to construct said project.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, March 16, 1951.

"WM. A. EGAN,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET O. GRISHAM,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Approved by the Governor March 19, 1951.

"ERNEST GRUENING,

"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution adopted by the National Jewish Youth Conference, of New York, N. Y., relating to the resurgence of nazism in Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Women's League of the United Synagogue of America, New York, N. Y., signed by Mrs. Emanuel Siner, national president, and Mrs. Theodore Krohn, national chairman for social action, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide food grain to India; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Grand Lodge, Knights of Pythias, Grand Domain of Indiana, relating to communism and the overthrow of people's rights of free government and religious worship; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the directors of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association and Eastern Bituminous Coal Association, in joint session, protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of J. Hyzak, praying for the continuation of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of Harry S. Wolin and sundry other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for



the continuation of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Local 1199, Retail Drug Employees Union, New York, N. Y., signed by Milton B. Goldman, praying for the continuation of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Rochester, New York, and the Lions Club of West Monroe, La., favoring the continuation of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Philippine Shipowners Association, Manila, Philippine Islands, signed by Generoso F. Tanseco, president, remonstrating against the extension of charters to certain Philippine operators of United States maritime vessels (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Resolutions adopted by the Swabian Beneficial Society; the Allegheny Social Club; Col. Samuel D. Foster Chapter, No. 76, DAV; and the Auxiliary of Col. Samuel D. Foster Chapter, No. 76, DAV, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation providing a 17-percent pay increase for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from John K. Turton, of White Plains, N. Y., relating to financial aid to him in the publication of a manuscript prepared by him entitled "The Constitution for the People of the United States" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the General Confederation of Workers of Puerto Rico, Santurce, P. R., signed by Fco. Colon Gordiany, president, expressing their cooperation in the Nation's war efforts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the General Confederation of Workers of Puerto Rico, Santurce, P. R., signed by Fco. Colon Gordiany, president, praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the provisions of the Social Security Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

#### "House Resolution 38

"Resolution opposing the St. Lawrence seaway

"Whereas the Federal Government is again fostering the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project; and

"Whereas it would cost over a billion dollars to complete said project and would divert such sums from much more pressing needs and projects directly connected with the defense effort, and would also require many years for completion; and

"Whereas the records show that this seaway would be closed at least 5 months of each year due to ice conditions; and

"Whereas the completion of such a project would divert much traffic from Baltimore and be a serious threat to our economy as well as the plans now in progress for the development of the port of Baltimore; and

"Whereas the income of labor engaged in port work will be greatly affected; and

"Whereas many associated industries dependent upon the port may be required to lay off personnel; and

"Whereas United States-flag steamship lines have indicated it will be uneconomical to use said seaway even if completed: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the United States Congress be and it is hereby requested not to enact any legislation or make any appropriations for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the House of Delegates of Maryland send copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress.

"By the house of delegates, February 28, 1951.

"Introduced, read the first time, and adopted.

"By order Raymond H. Miller, Chief Clerk.

"JOHN C. LUEER,

"Speaker of the House of Delegates.

"RAYMOND H. MILLER,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A resolution adopted by the Hagerstown (Md.) Manufacturers' Bureau, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for giving to the State of Maryland and to abutting property owners within the State free and perpetual access to the water of the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### FEDERAL AID TO COMBAT NOXIOUS WEED HALOGETON—JOINT RESOLUTION AND ACT OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a joint resolution adopted by the Nevada Legislature, relating to adequate Federal aid in combating the noxious weed halogeton which is now infesting the ranges of the West. This weed poses a grave threat to the great livestock industry of the West, and at the present time has spread into 6 States. Unless effective and immediate action is taken this year, production of livestock will be seriously curtailed. At the present time, the livestock industry is being called on to break every record and produce more and more meat, badly needed in our defense build-up.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### Senate Joint Resolution 6

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to combat the noxious halogeton weed in the Western States

Whereas the livestock industry of Nevada is second to none in its importance to the economic welfare of this State; and

Whereas at this critical time of international emergency every stockman is being urged to increase production in view of the probability that food will be at a premium and demands for beef and wool will be greater; and

Whereas the noxious halogeton weed, known to grow on public domain lands in Nevada, has proved costly to sheep and cattle growers of the West, poisoning 1,300 sheep in one instance in a Western State; and

Whereas the President of the United States has not requested in his 1952 budget as presented to the Congress of the United States, any funds to combat this threat to the livestock industry, and more particularly, has not requested moneys whereby the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior could carry on jointly an oll-spray program and a reseeding campaign; and

Whereas local stockmen and county officials are being asked to contribute private funds to carry on this program on land of which the Federal Government is the landlord owner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to provide sufficient funds to carry on an effective program in the 1952 fiscal year to combat this threat to the West's livestock industry; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the Secretary of the State to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each of the United States Senators from Nevada, and to the Nevada Representative in Congress, to the Secretary of Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, and appropriately referred, a copy of an act just recently passed by the Nevada Legislature authorizing the State departments to undertake measures to combat this weed and appropriating \$20,000 for this work.

Mr. President, the States cannot, without Federal assistance, cope with this problem. First, because of the variety of ownership of the range lands and, secondly, because of the cost involved. Federal moneys and possibly Federal legislation are needed. Money is needed immediately, and I am hopeful that the departments concerned, together with the Bureau of the Budget, will submit estimates to the Congress requesting appropriations for this important work. When they are received Congress should act quickly, as this is an emergency and time is of the essence.

There being no objection, the act was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### Senate Bill 38

An act supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the inspection for and the destruction of noxious weeds, providing the manner of designation what constitutes a noxious weed, providing for the administration of this act, defining the duties of the State quarantine officer in relation thereto, defining the duties of county commissioners in relation to this act, making an appropriation for carrying out the provisions of this act, providing penalties for the violation thereof, and other matters properly related thereto," approved March 29, 1929, and providing for the study of halogeton glomeratus, a poisonous weed, by the State department of agriculture; authorizing cooperation with any agency of the Federal Government, State, county, municipality, or any corporation, association, or individual; defining the duties of the State department of agriculture in connection therewith; making an appropriation therefor, and other matters properly relating thereto

The people of the State of Nevada, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The State department of agriculture is hereby authorized to conduct a study or studies, on the poisonous plant halogeton glomeratus, covering its distribution and prevalence, poisonous properties for livestock and means of combating them, and

methods of control under various conditions. To more effectively or economically conduct such study or studies, the State department of agriculture may cooperate, financially or otherwise, with any agency of the State or Federal Government, any county or municipality, or any corporations, association, organization, or individual.

Sec. 2. Any funds made available for carrying out the provisions of this act may be expended for the compensation of personnel, the payment of their necessary travel expenses and subsistence, as provided by law, the purchase or rental of equipment, the purchase of supplies, or the rental of test plots or other necessary facilities, and the publication of the results of any study or studies conducted under the provision of the act.

Sec. 3. The provisions of that certain act entitled "An act to provide for the inspection for and the destruction of noxious weeds, providing the manner of designation what constitutes a noxious weed, providing for the administration of this act, defining the duties of the State quarantine officer in relation thereto, defining the duties of county commissioners in relation to this act, making an appropriation for carrying out the provisions of this act, providing penalties for the violation thereof, and other matters properly related thereto," approved March 29, 1929, as amended, of which this act is supplemental, shall apply hereto: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way amending the act referred to above in this section.

Sec. 4. There is hereby appropriated from the general fund the sum of \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be available from and after the passage and approval of this act until June 30, 1953. All claims against this appropriation shall be approved by the State department of agriculture and forwarded to the State board of examiners for its approval and payment as provided by law.

Sec. 5. This act shall become effective immediately after its passage and approval.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 984. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; with amendments (Rept. No. 214).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 467. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; without amendment (Rept. No. 215).

#### FINANCING OF CERTAIN DEFENSE CONTRACTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably with amendments the bill (S. 998) to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 217) thereon.

I wish to say that the members of the committee who were present at the meeting of the committee were unanimous in reporting the bill on yesterday; and that all agencies of the Government and other interested parties are in agreement on the bill. There is great urgency for the passage of the bill. I am hopeful that when the call of the calendar is concluded we may obtain unanimous consent to consider the bill,

because it should be acted upon as promptly as possible.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that objection will be made to the bill. I wonder if the distinguished Senator would be willing that the bill lie over until 4 o'clock, before he attempts to have it considered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia realizes, of course, that the bill cannot be considered except by unanimous consent. He understands that a member of the committee from West Virginia has asked that the bill be objected to in his name. He will be back by 4 o'clock. I am sure, however, that when he hears an explanation made of the bill, he will not object.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1302. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Disabled American Veterans to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., from August 13, 1951, through August 16, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1303. A bill to provide for the method of appointing postmasters at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1304. A bill to extend insurance benefits granted by the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased veterans of World War II without any requirement as to the dependency of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1305. A bill to provide for an investigation by the General Accounting Office for the purpose of ascertaining the amounts of funds of the various Indian Tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for Mr. HUNT):

S. 1306. A bill to amend the Army Organization Act of 1950 to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1307. A bill for the relief of Victor Franz Pullwitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1308. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit retirement with full annuity after 30 years' service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of salaries, based upon the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 1309. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1310. A bill amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ECTON, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1311. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming re-

lating to the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF CERTAIN SECURITY LAWS

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 125), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the compilation of social-security laws, prepared by the Social Security Administration for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance, be printed as a Senate document.

#### RESTORATION OF GENERAL MACARTHUR TO POSTS OF COMMAND IN FAR EAST

Mr. NIXON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 126), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Whereas the overwhelming majority of the American people are shocked, disheartened, and angered over the removal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his posts of command in the Far East by action of the President of the United States; and

Whereas the strength and morale of the Armed Forces of the United States now engaged in the defense of the Nation against our enemies have been tragically weakened by this action of the President; and

Whereas the removal of General MacArthur from his posts of command reflects a policy of appeasement of the enemies of the United States: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States has not acted in the best interests of the American people in relieving of his commands and depriving the United States of the services of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and that the President should reconsider his action and should restore General MacArthur to the commands from which he was removed.

#### JOHN W. SMITH—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on January 23, 1951, there was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary the bill (S. 642) for the relief of John W. Smith. It is a bill relating to the correction of the record of an Air Force officer. Legislation relating to the correction of military records is under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 642) and that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated.

H. R. 2612. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 3196. An act to amend section 153 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Depart-



ment of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3587. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,  
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,  
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Harry A. McDonald, of Michigan, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission; and

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

John L. Rogers, of Tennessee, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner;

Harley D. Nygren, to be Lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

Ronald S. Jacobs, and sundry other persons for appointment in the United States Coast Guard; and

George Peter Adamson, and sundry other cadets, to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding hearings on proposed amendments to the Defense Production Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE PRICE OF LEAD—LETTER BY SENATOR ANDERSON

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, regarding the price of lead, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SHOULD THE RFC BE ABOLISHED?—RADIO DEBATE BETWEEN SENATOR KEM AND WENDELL BERGE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the transcript of a radio debate held April 8, 1951, between himself and Wendell Berge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, on the subject Should the RFC Be Abolished? which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CONCENTRATION OF POWER IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—BROADCAST BY FORMER SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by former Senator Arthur Capper, on April 8, 1951, regarding concentration of power in the Federal Government, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### POSTHUMOUS DECORATION OF CPL. BOBBY SMITH, OF ANDERSON, S. C.

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial commenting on the posthumous decoration of Cpl. Bobby Smith, of Anderson, S. C., published in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent, of April 5, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Now, Mr. President?" published in the Washington News of April 11, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### EASING GERMAN CONTROLS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper editorial entitled "Easing German Controls," published in the Washington Star of April 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE DAKOTA COWBOY WHO BECAME PRESIDENT—ARTICLE FROM THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Dakota Cowboy Who Became President," written by Hjalmar Bjornson, and published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of April 8, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED AID TO INDIA—LETTER FROM ROBERT DELSON

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Robert Delson, published in the Washington Post, April 11, 1951, regarding proposed aid to India, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE UNITED NATIONS AND COMMUNIST CHINA—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. MCCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the war in Korea and the relations between the Chinese Communist government and the United Nations, written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ATTITUDE OF BRITISH LABOR PARTY TOWARD GENERAL MACARTHUR—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. MCCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Star, regarding the attitude of the British Labor Government toward the muzzling or removal of General MacArthur, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### USE OF CHINESE NATIONALIST TROOPS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. MCCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding the proposed use of Chinese Nationalist troops, published in the Washington Evening Star, of April 10, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### GRAFT ENDANGERS FEDERAL SERVICE—NEWS LETTER OF REPRESENTATIVE FRED MARSHALL

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the weekly news letter of Representative Fred Marshall, of Minnesota, published in the March 22 issue of the Verdale (Minn.) Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE OF MINNEAPOLIS—ARTICLE BY RUSSELL ASLESEN

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Russell Aslesen and published in the Minneapolis Tribune, on March 25, 1951, referring to the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DRAFT DEFERMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS—EDITORIAL FROM MINNEAPOLIS MORNING TRIBUNE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the recent action by the Department of Defense and Selective Service authorizing draft deferments for close to a million college students making high scores in intelligence tests has provoked a storm of criticism throughout the country. As evidence of the thinking of people in Minnesota, I submit an editorial published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, Thursday, April 5, entitled "We Don't Want Draft To Breed a Caste System."

No one would deny the importance of maintaining our educational institutions both in peacetime and in periods of defense or war. The training of competent personnel in the sciences, arts, literature, and humanities is of vital importance to the strength of our democracy. Scientific knowledge, in particular, is imperative for modern defense and national security. Equally important is an understanding of the basic political and economic problems which confront our people and the world. It is evident that an informed and trained citizenry is the backbone and strength of a free people. However, in our desire to maintain and develop our program of education, we must make every provision to give equality of treatment and opportunity.

As the Minneapolis Tribune editorial appropriately notes, the proposed intelligence tests are not an accurate measurement and could well discriminate against many young men.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD. It brings to the attention of the Congress a subject of vital importance and one that must be resolved without jeopardizing either the strength of our armed services or the democratic standards of our society.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WE DON'T WANT DRAFT TO BREED A CASTE SYSTEM

Two of today's letters to the Tribune reflect widespread and ominous resentment at President Truman's recent order authorizing draft deferments for a million college students making high scores in intelligence tests to be given at a thousand places in May and June.

There is a growing feeling that this method of selecting men for compulsory military service is morally and socially repugnant and not in the national interest. We strongly share this feeling.

We are as concerned as anyone that the United States shall not lack scientists, engineers, scholars, and well-educated men in the years ahead. We do not want to rear a generation devoid of well-trained leaders in

fields which require years of higher education.

But we do not want a Nation divided on class lines. We do not want Armed Forces filled with men harboring deep resentment against their contemporaries whose parents are sufficiently well situated to send them to college or who grew up in an environment in which the passing of the sort of tests to be given next month is made relatively easy.

The values we cherish will not be defended by men who feel that the social status or the environment into which they happened to be born qualified them for potential cannon fodder while the social status or environment into which others of their age happened to be born exempted them from having to do kitchen police, take scoldings from a drill sergeant, or help defend the Nation in some strange and unpleasant place far from home.

There must be some better way in which to provide the Armed Forces with the number of men required for its ground forces during the critical years ahead than the method adopted by President Truman at the behest of selective service and those who put their faith in multiple choice tests.

It is one of the glories of American life that many youths from low income families obtain higher education. Scholarships in endowed private institutions supplement the opportunities afforded by our highly developed system of municipal and State-supported colleges and universities. Families make tremendous sacrifices to supplement what ambitious students without means earn to pay for a college education. Many of our ablest leaders acquired their higher education by these means. We hope such aids will increase, along with the determination of youths with their eyes on the stars to widen their intellectual horizons.

But the fact remains that a very large number of our youths, no less worthy than those who go to college and no less dear to their families, do not go to college or acquire the means to make a good showing on those multiple-choice tests upon which the Armed Forces, among others, set such store.

A youth who grows up in a home or goes to a school where vocabularies are limited and where there is not much discussion of current events, scientific progress, or cultural topics does not develop the literary or reading comprehension which youths reared in more favored homes or schools acquire without effort. A youth reared in the rural South or in many urban homes may be as intelligent as a youth whose environment and schooling enables him to make a high score on the proposed tests. He may become an Al Smith, a Charlie Wilson, or some other leader who outshines the average product of a cultured home and a first-class school but he wouldn't make much of a showing on the proposed tests because he has not yet come up against the problems propounded by the authors of the tests.

Some of these low scorers will be just what our Armed Forces need because their innate intelligence, not revealed in the tests, will make them natural leaders. They will quickly grasp the techniques of using the complex weapons and equipment of a modern army.

But those found fit only for military services under such a basis of selection are likely to be regarded by the unthinking—and to regard themselves—as the less bright members of their generation. Such a basis of deferment would create a caste system in which one set of youths is regarded as privileged and another feels discriminated against.

So long as our Armed Forces must be raised by drafts they should include those able to make high scores in multiple choice tests as well as those making poor scores. No matter how brilliant, a youth should benefit by briefly sharing the experiences of a majority of his generation in basic training and K. P. And he will get along with his fellows a great

deal better than if he is marked as one too bright to serve his country in the way a lesser breed without the multiple choice tests has to serve it.

#### PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—ARTICLE FROM THE ALBUQUERQUE JOURNAL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the plan to reorganize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and against any motion that would attempt to kill that agency. As a result of the current investigation, a great many people have come to the conclusion that the RFC has a bad loaning record, and that no good has come out of it. I believe that it is right and proper to see that any questionable acts of any governmental agency should be properly investigated and appropriate action taken. But it also needs to be remembered that the RFC has a wonderful record of making good loans out of proposals that had been found to be difficult for the ordinary banking facilities of this Nation.

In that process, literally hundreds of small businesses have been saved. In fact, I am informed that about 90 percent of RFC loans are to small firms. Many small firms in my State of New Mexico have been helped in the past, and loans are still being made in my State. The RFC should not be destroyed. It should be reformed and be allowed to continue its essential service to small firms.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a newspaper article which appeared in the Albuquerque Journal on April 5, 1951, entitled "RFC Makes \$1,000,000 in Loans to New Mexico Firms, Companies Here Get Aid."

The article gives an idea of the great amount of good that is being done by the RFC in New Mexico in assisting firms that could not get private financing at all, or could not obtain the full amount required to develop and expand their businesses.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Loans to New Mexico firms of \$1,091,000 in 1951 have been reported by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

R. A. Brownell, RFC Denver manager, said \$211,500 loans were made direct to seven firms. In addition RFC participated one-third to three-fourths in 21 loans through banks totaling \$879,500.

Brownell listed direct loans as follows:

Albuquerque—Derwood O. Mallow, \$15,500; Star Drive-In, \$25,000; Superlite Materials Corp., \$50,000.

Aztec—El Aztec Hotel, \$25,000.

Sante Fe—Hovey Concrete Products Co., \$48,000.

Springer—L. H. McIntyre, \$25,000.

Toas—Frank Templeton, Jr., \$30,000.

RFC participates as follows in these loans: Seventy-five percent with First National of Albuquerque to Eidal Mfg. Co., \$80,000.

Seventy percent with Albuquerque National to Albuquerque firms—Benton Van & Storage Co., \$65,000; Briner Rust Proofing Co., \$100,000; Hollywood Poultry & Egg Co., \$17,000; and to Ready Mix Concrete Co., Los Alamos, \$87,500; and Acme Mud Co., Farmington, \$40,000.

Seventy percent with New Mexico State Bank in nine loans to Mount McCollum Con-

struction Co., \$303,000; with First National of Raton to Cartwright Lumber Co., Cimarron, \$35,000.

Sixty-six and two-thirds percent with Grants State Bank to Grants Mill Works, \$8,500; and A. E. Blevins, \$36,000.

Fifty percent with First National of Las Vegas to Stevens Oil Co., Las Vegas, \$35,000; with Albuquerque National to Albuquerque Brick & Tile Co., \$37,500.

Thirty-three and one-third percent with First National of Santa Fe to Rowley's Baker, Santa Fe, \$45,000.

#### PROTEST BY SENATOR WILEY AGAINST STATEMENT BY FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION REGARDING MOTION PICTURES AND TELEVISION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week fair-minded observers were very much surprised when the Federal Communications Commission issued an arbitrary statement attempting to browbeat the motion-picture industry so as to force it to allow its stars to appear on television, and to force it to sell its movies to television. Immediately on learning of the FCC's dictatorial action, I sent a letter to Chairman Coy protesting against the prejudging by his Commission of a case in which the motion-picture industry has never even been permitted to present its arguments.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to defend the motion-picture industry or to speak ill of any case the television industry might have. On the contrary, I have merely protested—and now renew the protest—against the FCC's whole procedural approach, just as I would similarly protest against the attempt by any other Federal commission which might violate what I felt to be the canons of sound judicial procedure. Attempting to interfere with property rights in ex parte hearings is not the American way.

I should like to point out that not just the Hollywood motion-picture producers are involved in this issue, but some 17,000 theaters throughout the country, principally small businesses. The FCC should not so lightly consider a grave action which might, in effect, close down some or all of those theaters, and thus bring about a staggering train of inevitably harsh consequences, such as theater bankruptcies, unemployment, loss of tax revenue to the Federal Government, and so forth.

Let me point out once again, as I did in my letter, that, in addition to the movie industry, there are involved numerous other industries which place restrictions on television as to the use of their properties.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to call attention to the fact that there has been somewhat of a tendency to make the motion-picture industry a "whipping boy" on many occasions. In my opinion, neither this nor any other industry should be treated in such fashion. I am speaking in the interest of fair play—on behalf of the principle of equity and justice. It is one thing to call attention to faults which may exist; it is another thing to use a smear brush promiscuously, whether it be on the issue of Reds—who should have absolutely no place in Hollywood or in any other public medium—or on any other issue.



As this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point:

(a) The text of my original letter to Chairman Coy to which I have not as yet received acknowledgment or reply;

(b) The text of an editorial carried in the New York Times on April 4 on this issue;

(c) A very stimulating analysis made by Mr. Abram S. Myers, general counsel and chairman of the board of the Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors, located in Suite 1131 of the Dupont Circle Building. I invite particular attention to this analysis which Mr. Myers has made of what he regards as the FCC's "blackjack." I believe that in his memorandum he reflects very carefully the judgment of the many theater owners of Wisconsin who are affiliated with his association.

I could not, of course, and would not attempt a final evaluation as to the merit of each point of that analysis, since I would want to study both sides of the case in great detail before doing so. However, I believe that Mr. Myers has made an important contribution in emphasizing some of the dire implications of the FCC's action.

I repeat, Mr. President, it is not my purpose to intervene on behalf of any party to this dispute. I have a tremendously high regard for great television medium, just as I respect movie producers and exhibitors. It is not my purpose to decide who is right and who is wrong, but rather to seek fairness of procedure by the Federal Communications Commission in the consideration of an issue fraught with very serious possibilities.

There being no objection, the letter, editorial, and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
March 31, 1951.

HON. WAYNE COY,  
Chairman, Federal Communications  
Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you to convey my respectful opinion in opposition to the approach adopted by the FCC in making a gratuitous attack against the motion-picture industry. I refer to the comments which you made under sections 19 and 20 of your report dated March 28, 1951, relative to the uniform policy to be followed in licensing radio broadcasting stations where violations of antitrust and other laws are alleged.

I am writing to you in my capacity as former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which was responsible for the adoption of the Administrative Procedure Act. As you appreciate, I am sure, one of the cardinal features of that act was that no individual or company could become subject to adverse ruling by a Federal Government commission until the individual or company had had fair opportunity for a thorough hearing in which it could present its side of the case. It seems to me that the FCC stepped out of bounds as a quasi-judicial body insofar as the Administrative Procedure Act is concerned when in sections 19 and 20 it, in effect, indicted the motion-picture industry for withholding the use of its stars and films from television without giving that industry any opportunity to participate in public hearings on this question.

I want to make myself absolutely clear on this point. I am not defending the motion-

picture industry; I am not saying whether your comments on movies and TV might in the long run have merit or not, nor am I in any way attempting to judge the strength or weakness of the television industry's case.

All I am saying is that neither the FCC nor any other Federal commission operating under the Administrative Procedure Act should prejudge a case until there has been a hearing, notice of the issues, presentation of evidence, and arrival at a decision.

It seems to me to do otherwise is, in effect, to establish a drumhead court-martial procedure, in which the defendant, without being present, is tried without even being indicted and is otherwise treated in a manner worthy of Russia's "courts" but not ours.

I do not feel that the FCC should intimidate or coerce the motion-picture industry or any other industry. An indictment without hearings amounts to such intimidation.

I want to point out that there are a tremendous amount of related questions which would arise in such a hearing; for example, the relationship between restrictions imposed by professional sports, radio, etc., on the use of their contract people on TV.

I would very much appreciate hearing from you, and perhaps from your associates on the Commission, and securing from you an explanation of just how the Commission can justify, if at all, its very unusual and, to my way of thinking, extra-legal approach to this question.

Thanking you for your kind consideration, and with all good wishes, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

[From the New York Times of April 4, 1951]

#### POOH-BAH OF THE ELECTRONIC AGE

The FCC has overreached itself. Its warning to the Hollywood producers that they turn over their films and stars to TV, lest they jeopardize their own chances to enter video broadcasting, is an arbitrary and capricious action that flouts the elementary principles of a competitive economy and raises serious questions of law.

In what it calls a statement of policy the Commission in effect is insisting that Hollywood must come to the aid and succor of its chief competitor. The stars, directors, and other craftsmen in whom the film capital has built a substantial investment over the years, the Commission suggests, now should be made available to the industry's growing rival. The one thing which television does not have—the up-to-date, full-length picture which may cost millions of dollars—Hollywood now is expected to furnish on television's terms.

The FCC ignores completely in its statement the economic realities which today separate Hollywood and television. The only reason that the motion-picture industry can afford to make its feature films is because it has the box office to pay for them. Even the least expensive film requires a gross of \$1,000,000 or more to show a profit. The most expensive show on television today, including the cost of talent and time on the air, runs to \$85,000.

Apparently the FCC is unconcerned, however, whether Hollywood goes broke in serving as the involuntary sugar daddy of television. Its statement merely notes that the motion picture companies "refuse to make copies of their films available for use by television stations." Would a brand-new picture have to be released immediately to TV? Or after it had been seen in the second-run houses? Or when? Whatever the answer, the practical result would be for a governmental agency and not the producers to run the private film industry. That is a bleak and fearsome prospect.

The legal reasoning behind the Commission's action may give cause for even greater concern than its peculiar economic think-

ing. Superficially, the FCC merely is saying that if a motion-picture concern has been found in violation of the antitrust laws in its own field it will take that fact into consideration should the company ask for a television license. Indeed, the FCC has no alternative in this regard.

But the Commission then takes the extraordinary step of superseding both Congress and the Department of Justice in deciding without benefit of any public hearing what may constitute an antitrust violation. Whether or not the refusals of the film companies to turn over to television their films and players is a violation of the law, the FCC says in so many words, the Commission will consider them relevant in granting a TV license. The FCC evidently aspires to be the Pooh-Bah of the electronic age.

The Commission on its own initiative should reconsider its latest statement of policy. Failing that, it is a matter which should commend itself to the prompt attention of Congress.

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WIELDS BLACKJACK

The Federal Communications Commission has just issued a declaration of policy, called a report, which sets a new record for usurpation of authority.<sup>1</sup>

By this report the Commission—

1. Imposes a condition on the right of motion-picture companies to qualify for broadcasting licenses based on information coming to it from an unidentified source and without specific findings based upon evidence adduced in support of or opposition to any application for a license.

2. Asserts the authority to regulate the motion picture industry and the use it shall make of its properties although no such authority has been conferred on it by Congress.

3. Would compel the motion-picture companies to make available to television broadcasters their finest films and talent as a condition to the right to qualify for broadcasting licenses.

The report was issued as a result of a hearing held a year ago looking to the establishment of a uniform policy to be followed in the licensing of radio broadcast stations to applicants accused or convicted of violating a law of the United States.

The point set down for hearing, as enumerated in the report, did not even hint that the Commission wished to be enlightened as to its authority to advise prospective applicants for licenses or renewals as to the use which they should make of properties which are not subject to the Commission's regulatory powers, in order to qualify for such licenses or renewals.

Specifically, there was not the slightest intimation that the Commission had in mind the possibility of a ruling or even an expression of opinion to the effect that the motion-picture companies, in order to be eligible for licenses or renewals, must first make their choicest film and contract artists available for exhibition on television.

While we have not examined all the briefs and arguments offered at the hearing in April 1950, we do not believe that any such startling proposal entered into the discussion. So revolutionary and drastic a proposal would have attracted wide attention and most certainly would have come to our notice.

Sometime between the close of the hearing and the issuance of the report the Commission either evolved the idea, or it was planted with it, that it could force the motion-picture companies to supply their best available films and talent to this rival entertainment medium in order to qualify for licenses.

<sup>1</sup> Docket No. 9572, March 29, 1951.

The report recites blandly that "It has come to the Commission's attention that many motion-picture companies refuse to make copies of their films available for use by television companies." It then goes on to say that "the success of television will depend, to a large measure, on the ability of television stations to acquire the best available films and to use the best available talent and stories in their programs."

It would be interesting, and it may become necessary to ferret out the source of this information that "has come to the Commission's attention." We are confident that it was not openly supplied by the participants in this quasi-judicial inquiry. The motion-picture companies represented at the hearing apparently had no warning that such a catastrophic ruling was in contemplation. And the thousands of independent theater owners, who are the concern of this association, had no reason to suspect that their interests were involved, much less in jeopardy.

#### WILL THE COMMISSION NOW REGULATE THE MOVIES?

It doesn't seem possible that the Commission itself could have realized the full implications of its action.

In order to make good on these primary principles, which are to guide it in making a case-to-case determination of these applications, the Commission must exercise strict control over the motion-picture companies, even to the extent of fixing prices for their products.

Let us consider what could, and doubtless will, happen if the Commission persists in the policy of requiring the motion-picture companies to place their best available films at the disposal of its competitor in the entertainment field. A film company desiring a license asserts in its application that it has conformed to the Commission's requirement. A TV station objects and complains that the applicant has not made its best films available. Is the Commission going to set itself up as an expert to pass on the quality of motion pictures?

But that is child's play compared to the difficulties that will arise when a TV station complains—and this will happen—that the applicant has sought to evade the Commission's policy by charging film rentals too high for it to pay. The Commission has proceeded in happy ignorance of the cost of producing the best pictures and the methods used in pricing them, or else it has made the cold-blooded determination to subsidize TV at the expense of the motion-picture industry and thus confiscate the latter's property without just compensation.

We are forced to this conclusion because we do not believe it could have been contemplated by the Commission or the person or persons who persuaded it to adopt this policy, that TV would pay film rentals approximating those derived from the theaters.

Admission to a first-run or key neighborhood theater usually is 50 cents or more. Those theaters pay film rentals ranging from 25 percent to 40 percent of the gross receipts. If the film companies must make their best pictures available to television, they will be entitled to and should demand the same rentals, based on the same factors, that are charged the theaters. But when they demand that the TV people pay from 12½ cents to 20 cents for each claimed spectator—and we mean the claims they make in seeking sponsors—they will run sniveling to the Commission and claim that the movie companies are flouting the Commission's policy.

Then the Commission will either have to back down on its policy or start fixing the price of film.

#### COMMISSION WOULD DESTROY GOVERNMENT'S REVENUE

The country is engaged in a mighty preparedness campaign, the object of which is to insure peace. The Congress is confronted

with the task of imposing additional taxes to sustain the effort.

Although the motion-picture business is currently in a serious slump, due in some measure to the free entertainment afforded by television, the United States Government still collects a 20-percent tax on every paid admission to a motion-picture theater.

These admission taxes collected from movie patrons amount to about \$300,000,000 a year.

Yet the Federal Communications Commission by its declared policy of building up television at the expense of the movies would jeopardize, certainly greatly reduce and possibly destroy, this valuable source of revenue.

This grave consequence, evidently not realized or taken into account by the Commission, illustrates the danger of adopting policies affecting industries which are not subject to the Commission's jurisdiction without a full, complete, and open investigation in the course of which information on all angles of the subject is obtained from those most affected and best equipped to furnish it.

Unless the Commission recedes from its position, this phase of the matter should receive the attention of Congress while the tax bill is under consideration.

#### AND IT MAY STILL BE ALL FOR NAUGHT

The gratuitous nature of the Commission's dictum, and the fact that compliance therewith still will not guarantee any film company a broadcasting license, is one of the most serious aspects of its action.

The greater part of the report deals with the points which were set down for hearing. That part of the report was within the Commission's authority and we have no special fault to find with the conclusions reached. It is true, as the Commission says, that "the major motion-picture companies . . . have violated the antitrust laws over a period of years in the motion-picture field." We think it follows, as the Commission concludes, that such violations are "a matter that the Commission must consider carefully in determining the qualifications of these companies to operate in the public interest."

That is an issue between the film companies and the Commission in which the independent exhibitors have no direct interest. It is a question which will have to be resolved on a case-to-case basis when and if those companies apply for licenses.

The only phase of the report that affects the theater owners—and it threatens their very existence—is the next to last paragraph therein which says that the motion picture companies must make their best films, performers, and stories available to television in order to be eligible for a license.

Because it is alien to the questions set down for hearing and does not even deal with adjudged violations of law, it seems to have been added as an irrelevant afterthought. The Commission is careful to say, "We express no opinion at this time as to whether such practices (not supplying films, etc., to TV) are or are not in violation of the antitrust laws." So far as we are aware, no law provides and no court has ever held that it is a violation of law for a private corporation, acting alone and not in concert with others to choose its own customers. And yet the whole purpose of the proceeding was to determine the weight to be given law violations in the granting of licenses.

To reduce the Commission's position to complete absurdity, let us suppose that a motion picture company has attempted in good faith to comply with the Commission's policy; has made its best films available to TV and thus destroyed their value for exhibition in the theaters. It has destroyed one vast market in hopes of gaining another. And then the Commission, applying the principles discussed in the first six and a half pages of its report, decides that it cannot grant a license to that film company because

of its antecedent violations in the motion picture field.

#### MOWING DOWN THE INNOCENT BYSTANDERS

The report gives the impression that the Commission moved by some undisclosed impulse hurled a rock at the film companies; but it struck the exhibitors.

It might at least have given consideration to the extent of the havoc which its policies, if carried out, will wreak among the motion-picture exhibitors.

When a picture is shown on television its boxoffice value in the area in which it is shown is destroyed. About 17,000 theaters are dependent upon an adequate supply of box-office attractions. Of the \$2,700,000,000 invested in the entire industry, only \$160,000,000 is invested in production and distribution. All of the remainder (94 percent) is invested in theaters.

The 1940 census shows that 177,420 persons were employed in the motion picture industry. Of these, 33,687 were engaged in production; 11,332 in distribution, and 132,401 in exhibition.

Thus the Federal Communications Commission, of its own motion, has laid down a policy which, if carried out, would endanger the more than \$2,000,000,000 invested in theaters and threaten the livelihood of many. The rule prescribed by Congress for the granting of licenses is that "the public convenience, interest, or necessity will be served." Certainly Congress never contemplated that the public interest could be served by tearing down an established industry in order to help a rival industry which, once the novelty has worn off, may not retain public favor.

Despite all the hullabaloo television's future is still clouded with uncertainty. Its forward surge has slowed down to a walk. Those who glibly predict that television will supplant the movies should read the feature story in the Wall Street Journal for March 26, 1951, entitled, "Teetering TV." The Communications Commission may wake up some day and find it has backed the wrong horse. In the meantime, grave damage may result from its present policies. They call for stern resistance by the motion picture industry, the theaters, as well as the producers.

#### THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to \$15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile, was announced as first in order.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. JENNER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state the question. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

#### REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to say that I have just issued a release which I desire to read to my colleagues. It is as follows:

The only question is whether we were fighting in Korea to win. MacArthur told



us the only way we could win was with more manpower. That was a military issue. Our Government was planning to send additional troops to Europe, where there was no fighting, and leave the men in Korea to fight a war of attrition with no hope of victory.

The administration refused even to work with the 2,000,000 fighting men from South Korea and Free China, who begged to fight against the Communists.

The American people have the right to know what are the military issues. Congress has the right to know what are the military issues. Statements of fact on the question of American security are entirely proper communications from a general in the field, to the American people.

Who wants to hide the facts? Who wants us not to win in Korea? Who wants a long-drawn-out war of attrition in which thousands more of American soldiers are killed to no purpose?

That is the question which Congress must answer.

This is another Pearl Harbor. Once again the military situation is used to cover up the political chicanery of the palace guard. They are planning something devious, we don't know what. Our allies know, but Congress does not. The administration kow-towed to our allies. England announces that Red China must be represented in the Japanese peace settlement, and must be given Formosa. Are we going along in a phony peace move in which we will surrender to the Communists everything for which our men have died? Meanwhile the men in the Politburo are watching every move we make. We dare not make the small mistake.

Congress cannot wait until years have passed to find out what is hidden beneath the confusion. Congress must find out now.

This is no Republican victory. Republicans cannot rejoice at a political advantage which means our country is in danger.

This issue is not for the Republicans in Congress but for all true Americans in Congress. We are not being governed by the Democratic Party. We are not being governed by the Fair Deal. I charge that this country today is in the hands of a secret inner coterie which is directed by agents of the Soviet Union. They have formed a popular front government like that in France in the thirties and we know how France was taken from within.

We have asked the President to dismiss Secretary Acheson, who would not turn his back on Communist agents in the State Department. We have asked the President to dismiss General Marshall who was the tool of Soviet agents in his betrayal of China and loss of our allies in Asia.

It is too late now for such minor remedies. We must cut this whole cancerous conspiracy out of our Government at once. Our only choice is to impeach President Truman and find out who is the secret invisible government which has so cleverly led our country down the road to destruction.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries will refrain from any demonstration, such being a violation of the rules of the Senate; and the Chair intends to enforce the rules.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 32, Calendar No. 21?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state that under the rule, 5 minutes' debate is in order on any bill on the calendar. Although it has been customary to permit 5 minutes' debate under

a reservation to the right to object, technically, under the rule, that is not in order. However, inasmuch as it has been customary to do so, the Chair will not abrogate that custom now. Nevertheless, under the rule, when strictly interpreted, the reservation of the right to object does not authorize a Senator to make a speech on a general subject, during the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding of the announcement just made by the distinguished occupant of the chair is that if during the call of the calendar a bill comes before the Senate, any Senator who wishes to speak for 5 minutes on the bill has a right to do so. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Then let the bill come up.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 32?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill goes over.

#### PROTECTION AGAINST MISBRANDING, ETC., OF FUR PRODUCTS AND FURS

The Secretary will call the next bill on the calendar.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 80, Senate bill 508—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is nothing to object to as yet, for the next bill on the calendar has not been called.

The next bill will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 508) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

#### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from New Hampshire reserving the right to object to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TOBEY. I am propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. The question is: The Senator from New Hampshire desires to address the Senate of the United States on a matter of privilege which involves misrepresentation and partial truths and the most serious charges against Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives. I request that privilege at the earliest opportunity, and recognition by the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator that at any time a Senator may rise to a question of personal privilege if he states the question

of personal privilege. However, in the situation now existing, in the midst of the call of the calendar, a Senator who did so would be required to confine himself to the matter of privilege which he raised.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I suppose that every word a Senator might speak in that hypothetical case need not be a verb or a noun, but might have descriptive application to the subject matter of the talk. Is that not true?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator might use some of his adverbs which would not necessarily apply. [Laughter.]

Mr. TOBEY. I will promise you, Mr. President, that all of them will end in "ly."

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that I may speak on this matter before the Senate of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not have to request such unanimous consent.

Mr. TOBEY. I wanted to hit the nail on the other side and clinch it; that is all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the Senator has the right to rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. TOBEY. I so rise, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is not confined to 5 minutes, under the rule governing the consideration of bills on the calendar.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on Friday of last week, I asked the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to call an executive session of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Subcommittee. When the meeting was convened on Monday, I laid certain facts before the members of the committee, facts of extreme importance. I told the committee that I was giving them these facts in confidence, so that they would be fully aware of what was going on. But someone present broke the trust of confidence. This resulted in the appearance in several newspapers of a partial story of the matter. Therefore, so that the whole truth may be known, I rise and make this statement.

The Subcommittee on Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been doing research work and making investigations on RFC matters for many months. I was a member of that subcommittee; and on January 29 the subcommittee's report was printed. I was one of the signers of the report. It is Report No. 76. In the Eighty-second Congress, I ceased to be a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; but the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] requested that I still sit with the subcommittee in public hearings, having been familiar with the work; and this I did.

In March, about a week before the President left on his southern trip, the Reconstruction Finance Subcommittee was in session and heard testimony of Merle Young and others. Two of those witnesses contradicted one another; and so I said, "Mr. Chairman, in my opinion

one of these witnesses is lying, and we should get the truth."

The following day the White House called my office, while I was in the committee session, and asked my secretary to have me call the President. I returned to my office and called the White House, in response to the President's call. The President said that he was interested in my declaration that I was going into the question of perjury having been committed, because someone was lying, and he wanted to know who was lying, and said that whoever it was ought to be punished. He said—and I honored him for it—that he did not care who it was, whether it was his man or someone else. Then he went on to say that he had before him at least 300 letters from Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, pushing special loans, and he also had—also had; mark the words—good information that a great many of them—Senators and Members of the House of Representatives—received fees for what they did. I said, "Mr. President, can I get that evidence from you?" I felt that if he had such evidence, it should be given the committee at once. He answered that he would give me any information he had.

Two days later I called the White House to get the alleged evidence from the President. I was told he was resting, and that he would call me back when he got up. No call came back to me that day.

The next day I called him on the telephone and told him I wanted to come to see him that day. He replied that his list of callers was large that day, but that he would let me know if he could see me. I did not hear from him.

The next day was Thursday, the day before he was to leave for the South on his vacation. Realizing the importance of this matter, I determined to see him before he left for his vacation. I called his secretary, Matt Connolly, and told him that I must see the President that day, and I was given an appointment for 3:15.

When I met the President, I reminded him of the statement he had made to me over the telephone, and asked him to give the evidence to me, so that I could turn it over to the committee immediately. He said that he had thought the matter over, and felt that he should not give it to me, because he believed it would reflect on Congress and would only make existing prejudices stronger.

I returned to my office, concerned that the President had not followed through on his forthright original statement. He went South the next day, and I went to New York City that week end to attend the Senate Crime Committee hearings with the committee.

On my return from the New York hearings, on Monday, March 26, I wrote the President a letter, setting forth my deep convictions in the matter referred to. The letter reads as follows, and I think it speaks for itself:

MARCH 26, 1951.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You will remember that a few days before you left for the South, you telephoned me with regard to the hear-

ings before the Banking and Currency Subcommittee on RFC matters. In the course of that message you spoke of the letters you had received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which you were going over, and that you had evidence that a great many Members of Congress had taken fees for their part in aiding people to get RFC loans, and you would give me anything you had in evidence of this, and I told you I would come to see you. The day before you left for the South you received me and I said I had come asking for this evidence, and you replied that you had thought the matter over and did not wish to make it public, or words to that effect.

Since you have been away, I have been participating in the Senate Crime Committee hearings in New York and other places. I have asked myself over and over again how we are justified in investigating crime on the part of individuals all over the country, crime of various types and import, while at the same time withholding from the subcommittee and the public the information which you said you had and would give me. I am unable to justify this discrimination, therefore, I feel I must ask you to supply me with the data and evidence which you said you had that I may present same to the subcommittee and the Senate.

I have come to the conclusion that I cannot be a party to withholding such information and I believe that you, upon due consideration, will realize the enormity of such suppression. We both have a common interest and that is the welfare and well-being of the people and the people have a common stake in this matter. I believe it is right and absolutely essential that the people be advised of any evidence of wrongdoing by anybody, whether Members of the Congress or the crime element as we know them in this country. Guilt is personal in all such matters.

Therefore, I now come to you and ask if you will not reconsider this matter and turn over to me at once the evidence which you have, as you originally offered to do. I feel quite sure that after reconsideration, you will see both the wisdom and justice and necessity of so doing. If, however, you will not agree with me, I feel under deep conviction it is my duty to set forth the facts as you told them to me originally.

May I hear from you at once as to your decision?

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. TOBEY.

I received no word from the President for 2 days and the third day he called me on the phone and said he had received my letter, but that he did not have such evidence. He said that he had read letters from the RFC files and he had deduced or drawn conclusions of such things from those letters. He reminded me that those letters were available to me, or the committee, at any time, a fact of which I was well aware.

I confess I was amazed at the disparity between his original definite statement, as I have chronicled herein, and his last statement to me disclaiming he did have such evidence, for Senators will remember that, in the first part of his statement he said that he had 300 letters and had gone through them, and then he said, "and I also have good evidence that a great many Members of Congress have taken fees." So there are two separate clauses, one that he had read the letters, and the second that he also had evidence.

I think any Senator would agree with me that the President made a most serious indictment of Members of Congress

when he said he had this evidence. This was a charge which I could not believe was justified and so I asked for the evidence to turn it over to committee, evidence which was not produced. Feeling that the Senate subcommittee on RFC should know all the foregoing, I asked for this meeting in executive session, where I told the foregoing. I expressly stated that it was given in confidence.

I notice that some newspapers have referred to what is termed a "wire tapping" of the President's telephone conversation with me. This, in my judgment, constitutes a perfect example of misrepresentation. It is no secret, that recording devices are installed in United States Senators' offices when requested, for the purpose of taking records of telephone calls, as I often do, or to dictate speeches, and to have accurate records on file of important conversations, for our own recollection and our own understanding. It has been a great help to me, and I doubt not, to other Senators, and frequently I utilize this machine to make sure I have accurate record of conversations and evidence which comes to me, in the files, and oftentimes for dictation to be transcribed later. This machine was installed in my office, as well as other Senators' offices, by the Senate Sergeant at Arms office, as I said, and nobody ever suggested that it be taken away or altered or changed in any way.

When the President called, as so often is done when calls from important people come in, the conversation was recorded in the customary manner in order to be sure of the facts, both from the President's standpoint and my own.

My attention has been called to a ticker statement of this morning, "quoting informative sources as saying that I told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee an attempt had been made by the President to intimidate me." That statement was never made by me, so it is not true, and by no stretch of the imagination could I feel that any attempts were being made to intimidate me. So much for that distorted report.

I now wish to tell the Senate of a somewhat similar happening, which also involves the White House, and has to do with an attempt to influence a United States Senator from the full performance of his duty, as I see it. This matter also was presented to the subcommittee on Monday in executive session.

One of the names that has been brought into the testimony of the RFC Subcommittee hearings has been that of Donald Dawson of the White House staff. The subcommittee is desirous of having Mr. Dawson come before them to testify, but he has not seen fit to do so, although the subcommittee did invite him. One day about 2 weeks ago I had a telephone call from our former distinguished colleague from Montana, Burton K. Wheeler, and he said that David Niles of the White House entourage had called him on the telephone and said, "You knew Senator TOBEY"; Senator Wheeler said he did, and Mr. Niles said to Mr. Wheeler, "Will you communicate with him and ask him to 'go easy' on Donald Dawson?"



I am frank to say that I resented this White House pressure in this matter by the attempt to influence me through my friendship of long standing with Burton Wheeler, and that is what it certainly appeared, and today appears to me, to be. In all fairness, I want to say that when Senator Wheeler called me to the telephone he merely passed on Niles' request to him. He did not, by so much as a scintilla, or in any manner, or way of expression, apply any pressure and did not urge me in the matter at all. He was a voice relaying the message to me from Mr. Niles. I viewed the matter, and I think justly so, as an attempt of one of the White House palace guards to interfere with a Senator questioning witnesses in an investigation affecting one of the White House staff.

I say, Mr. President, that I think that such action is unethical and highly improper, and I resent that attempt to have me go easy or go soft on any man whose testimony we are trying to take to get at the truth.

There appeared in the press this morning a statement by Mr. Short, head of the White House press staff, that it was suggested that an effort be made to get Mr. Dawson and Senator TOBEY together, the idea being, according to the New York Times article, that if Senator TOBEY met Mr. Dawson he would see that Mr. Dawson was not such a bad fellow after all. That statement is entirely erroneous; there is not a word of truth in it. Nobody ever suggested, directly or indirectly, that I sit down with Mr. Dawson, look him in the face, and see what a magnetic personality he was, and the account in the New York Times this morning is the first time I ever heard of it.

In both these cases to which I have referred somebody broke the confidence and trust that I placed in them and partial truths, and only partial truths, of what occurred in the subcommittee room on Monday morning were given out.

This leaves me with no alternative but to give this full, complete, and honest statement of the two instances and happenings, which I have done, in justice to all concerned.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 508, the title of which has been stated?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN ADDISON COUNTY, VT., TO VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I enter an objection by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I withhold the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By request, the Senator from Kansas withholds his objection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this is a bill which is objected to by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. So far as I know, he is the only Member of the Senate who objects to its consideration. I cannot understand what motivates the Senator from Oregon. I had intended to move to the consideration of this bill at the last call of the calendar, and it was the Senator from Oregon who left the Chamber before it was reached, and I did not do so. I do not feel that I can await the Senator's convenience, or a time when he may see fit to be on the floor. Therefore, I wish to say that I shall move to take up this bill at the first opportunity, because it is a bill which must be acted upon now or never.

It relates to a research station which has been operated by the Federal Government. The Federal Government now proposes to give it up. It hopes to make arrangements whereby it will be operated by the Vermont Agricultural College. It must have the approval of the Vermont Legislature. The legislature expects to adjourn within 2 or 3 weeks. Therefore, Mr. President, I want to say that I shall move the consideration of the bill at the first opportunity, whether the Senator from Oregon is present or not.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, in keeping with a request which I received, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The bill will be passed over. The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

#### AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ACT OF 1946

The bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Educational Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health and nursing professions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

The bill (S. 435) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this measure, please?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Senate bill 435 would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide war-risk insurance for aircraft, air cargo, crews, and persons transported, together with their personal effects and baggage, when such insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and condi-

tions from commercial insurance companies.

The authority granted to the Secretary of Commerce by this bill may be exercised only with the approval of the President and after consultation with interested Federal agencies as the President may require. The bill is limited to 5 years. I invite especial attention to the fact that the bill is to be made effective only when no commercial insurance company is willing to take the risk. Air commerce in these days is compelled to fly in war areas, and it would seem that someone should bear the risk of such flights. The purpose of this bill is to make that possible.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 6, after line 12, to insert:

(d) Annual payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts by reason of costs incurred by the Government through the employment of appropriated funds by the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this title. These payments shall be computed by applying to the average monthly balance of appropriated funds retained in the revolving fund a percentage determined annually in advance by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such percentage shall not be less than the current average rate which the Treasury pays on its marketable obligations.

(e) The Secretary shall contribute to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil-service retirement system applicable to the employees engaged in carrying out the provisions of this title. The Secretary shall also contribute to the employees' compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Federal Security Administrator, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of the employees engaged in carrying out the provisions of this title. The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Secretary into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

And on page 10, line 4, after the word "the", to insert "aviation", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., title 49, secs. 401-581), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:*

#### "TITLE XIII—WAR-RISK INSURANCE

"SEC. 1301. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'American aircraft' includes 'civil aircraft of the United States' as defined in section 1 (15) of this act, and any aircraft owned or chartered by or made available to the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or the government of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia.

"(b) The term 'war risks' includes, to such extent as the Secretary may determine, all or any part of those risks which are described in 'free of capture and seizure' clauses, or analogous clauses.

"(c) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Commerce.

"Sec. 1302. (a) The Secretary, with the approval of the President, and after such consultation with interested agencies of the Government as the President may require, may provide insurance and reinsurance against loss or damage arising out of war risks in the manner and to the extent provided in this title, whenever it is determined by the Secretary that such insurance adequate for the needs of the air commerce of the United States cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from companies authorized to do an insurance business in a State of the United States: *Provided*, That no insurance shall be issued under this title to cover war risks on persons or property engaged or transported exclusively in air commerce within the continental United States (excluding Alaska).

"(b) Any insurance or reinsurance issued under any of the provisions of this title shall be based, insofar as practicable, upon consideration of the risk involved.

"Sec. 1303. The Secretary may provide the insurance and reinsurance, authorized by section 1302 with respect to the following persons, property, or interest:

"(a) American aircraft, and those foreign-flag aircraft owned by citizens of the United States or engaged in aircraft operations deemed by the Secretary to be in the interest of the national defense or the national economy of the United States, when so engaged.

"(b) Cargoes transported or to be transported on any such aircraft, including shipments by express or registered mail; air cargoes owned by citizens or residents of the United States, its Territories, or possessions; air cargoes imported to, or exported from, the United States, its Territories, or possessions and air cargoes sold or purchased by citizens or residents of the United States, its Territories, or possessions, under contracts of sale or purchase by the terms of which the risk of loss by war risks or the obligation to provide insurance against such risks is assumed by or falls upon a citizen or resident of the United States, its Territories, or possessions; air cargo transported between points in the United States and its Territories and possessions or between points in such Territories or possessions.

"(c) The personal effects and baggage of the captains, pilots, officers, and crews of such aircraft, and of other persons transported on such aircraft.

"(d) Captains, pilots, officers, members of the crews of such aircraft, and other persons employed or transported thereon against loss of life, injury, and detention by an enemy of the United States.

"(e) Statutory or contractual obligations or other liabilities of such aircraft or of the owner or operator of such aircraft of the nature customarily covered by insurance.

"Sec. 1304. (a) Any department or agency of the United States may, with the approval of the President, procure from the Secretary any of the insurance as provided for in this title, except as provided in sections 1 and 2 of the act of July 8, 1937 (50 Stat. 479).

"(b) The Secretary is authorized with such approval to provide such insurance at the request of the Secretary of Defense, and such other agencies as the President may prescribe, without premium in consideration of the agreement of the Secretary of Defense or such agency to indemnify the Secretary against all losses covered by such insurance, and the Secretary of Defense and such other agencies are authorized to execute such indemnity agreement with the Secretary.

"Sec. 1305. (a) To the extent that he is authorized by this title to provide insurance, the Secretary may reinsure, in whole or in part, any company authorized to do an insurance business in any State of the United States. The Secretary may reinsure

with, or cede or retrocede to, any such company, any insurance or reinsurance provided by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(b) Reinsurance shall not be provided by the Secretary at rates less than nor obtained by the Secretary at rates more than the rates established by the Secretary on the same or similar risks or the rates charged by the insurance carrier for the insurance so reinsured, whichever is most advantageous to the Secretary, except that the Secretary may make to the insurance carrier such allowances for expenses on account of the cost of services rendered or facilities furnished as he deems reasonably to accord with good business practice, but such allowance to the carrier shall not provide for any payment by the carrier on account of solicitation for or stimulation of insurance business.

"Sec. 1306. (a) Moneys appropriated by Congress to carry out the provisions of this title and all moneys received from premiums, salvage, or other recoveries and all receipts in connection with this title shall be deposited in a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States. Payments of return premiums, losses, settlements, judgments, and all liabilities incurred by the United States under this title shall be made from such funds through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department.

"(b) Such sums as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title are authorized to be appropriated to such fund.

"(c) At least annually, any balance in the revolving fund in excess of an amount determined by the Secretary to be necessary for the requirements of the fund, and for reasonable reserves to maintain the solvency of the fund shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) Annual payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts by reason of costs incurred by the Government through the employment of appropriated funds by the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this title. These payments shall be computed by applying to the average monthly balance of appropriated funds retained in the revolving fund a percentage determined annually in advance by the Secretary of the Treasury. Such percentage shall not be less than the current average rate which the Treasury pays on its marketable obligations.

"(e) The Secretary shall contribute to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the Civil Service Retirement System applicable to the employees engaged in carrying out the provisions of this title. The Secretary shall also contribute to the employees' compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Federal Security Administrator for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of the employees engaged in carrying out the provisions of this title. The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Secretary into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Sec. 1307. (a) The Secretary in the administration of this title, may issue such policies, rules, and regulations as he deems proper and may adjust and pay losses, compromise and settle claims, whether in favor of or against the United States and pay the amount of any judgment rendered against the United States in any suit, or the amount of any settlement agreed upon, in respect of any claim under insurance authorized by this title, but with respect to any aircraft which is insured under the provisions of this title, the amount of the claim adjusted, compromised, settled, adjudged, or paid shall

in no event exceed the amount stated in the policy, which shall not exceed an amount determined by the Secretary after consultation with the Civil Aeronautics Board to represent the fair and reasonable value of the aircraft. Each policy shall provide a stated amount to be paid in the event of total loss.

"(b) The Secretary may prescribe and change forms and policies, and fix, adjust, and change the amounts insured and rates of premium provided for in this title: *Provided*, That with respect to policies in effect at the time any such change is made, such change shall apply only with the consent of the insured.

"(c) The Secretary, in administering this title, may exercise his powers, perform his duties and functions, and make his expenditures, in accordance with commercial practice in the aviation-insurance business. Except as authorized in subsection (d) of this section, no insurance broker or other person acting in a similar intermediary capacity shall be paid any fee or other consideration by the Secretary by virtue of his participation in arranging any insurance wherein the Secretary directly insures any of the risk thereof.

"(d) The Secretary may, and whenever he finds it practical to do so shall, employ companies or groups of companies authorized to do an aviation-insurance business in any State of the United States, to act as his underwriting agent. The Secretary may allow such companies or groups of companies fair and reasonable compensation for servicing insurance written by such companies or group of companies as underwriting agent for the Secretary. The services of such underwriting agents may be utilized in the adjustment of claims under insurance provided by this title, but no claim shall be paid unless and until it has been approved by the Secretary. Such compensation may include an allowance for expenses reasonably incurred by such agent, but such allowance shall not include any payment by such agent on account of solicitation for or stimulation of insurance business.

"(e) The Secretary with the consent of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, including any field service thereof, may avail himself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"(f) The Secretary, in the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, shall prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act as amended (59 Stat. 597; 31 U. S. C. 841). The Secretary shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the said Government Corporation Control Act: *Provided*, That because of the business activities authorized by this title, the Secretary may exercise the powers conferred in said title, perform the duties and functions, and make expenditures required in accordance with commercial practice in the aviation insurance business, and the General Accounting Office shall allow credit for such expenditures when shown to be necessary because of the nature of such authorized activities.

"Sec. 1308. This title shall not affect rights of airmen under existing law.

"Sec. 1309. The Secretary shall include in his annual report to Congress a detailed statement of all activities and of all expenditures and receipts under his title for the period covered by such report and in addition make quarterly progress reports to the Congress with reference to contracts entered into, proposed contracts, and the general progress of his insurance activities.



"Sec. 1310. Upon disagreement as to a loss insured under this title, suit may be maintained against the United States in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in the United States district court in and for the district in which the claimant or his agent resides, notwithstanding the amount of the claim and any provision of existing law as to the jurisdiction of United States district courts, and this remedy shall be exclusive of any other action by reason of the same subject matter against any agent or employee of the United States employed or retained under this title. If the claimant has no residence in the United States, suit may be brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in any other United States district court in which the Attorney General of the United States agrees to accept service. The procedure in such suits shall otherwise be the same as that provided for suits in the district courts by title 28, United States Code, section 1346 (a) (2), so far as applicable. All persons having or claiming or who might have an interest in such insurance may be made parties either initially or upon the motion of either party. In any case where the Secretary acknowledges the indebtedness of the United States on account of such insurance, and there is a dispute as to the persons entitled to receive payment, the United States may bring an action in the nature of a bill of interpleader against such parties, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or in the United States district court of the district in which any such person resides. In such actions any party, if not a resident of or found within the district, may be brought in by order of court served in such reasonable manner as the court directs. If the court is satisfied that persons unknown might assert a claim on account of such insurance, it may direct service upon such persons unknown by publication in the Federal Register. Judgment in any such suit shall discharge the United States from further liability to any parties to such action, and to all persons when service by publication upon persons unknown is directed by the court. The period within which suits may be commenced contained in said act providing for bringing of suits against the United States shall, if claim be filed therefor within such period, be suspended from such time of filing until the claim shall have been administratively denied by the Secretary and for 60 days thereafter: *Provided, however*, That such claim shall be deemed to have been administratively denied if not acted upon within 6 months after the time of filing, unless the Secretary for good cause shown shall have otherwise agreed with the claimant.

"Sec. 1311. A person having an insurable interest in an aircraft may, with the approval of the Secretary, insure with other underwriters in an amount in excess of the amount insured with the Secretary, and, in that event, the Secretary shall not be entitled to the benefit of such insurance, but nothing in this section shall prevent the Secretary from entering into contracts of coinsurance.

"Sec. 1312. The authority of the Secretary to provide insurance and reinsurance under this title shall expire 5 years from the date of enactment of this title."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES SHELLENBERGER, JR.

The bill (S. 699) for the relief of James Shellenberger, Jr., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota withhold his objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the beneficiary under this claim is a little boy, now 4 years of age. This baby was born on January 8, 1947, in an Army hospital in Italy. At the time of his birth a solution labeled "One percent silver nitrate" was applied to each eye. The solution was, in fact, not what the label indicated, but was much stronger. It had the effect of completely destroying the sight of one eye and impairing the vision of the other eye at least 50 percent, at the present time. The child will go through life with this physical handicap. The Army admits that the accident was caused by its negligence.

The committee gave careful consideration to the bill, discussing the question at three different meetings, and was of the opinion that \$50,000 was not an excessive sum, considering the magnitude of the injuries to the child.

Let me say, Mr. President, that we called for the assistance and advice of insurance experts as to what revenue might come to this child from \$50,000 at the age of 21 years, and we were advised that approximately \$135 a month is all the child can expect, assuming that he receives \$50,000.

The amount of money involved does seem large. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. He thought the amount was very large. The committee had the subject before it on three different occasions. At first we thought the amount was large, but after giving the whole matter consideration and receiving the advice of experts on the subject, we believe that \$50,000 is not an excessive sum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have no personal objection to the consideration of this bill. I happened to be sitting in the chair of the majority leader, and I knew the bill was objected to on the last call of the calendar. I understand the Senator from South Carolina apparently has discussed this bill with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. May I have his opinion?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I studied the bill, and I am still of the opinion that the amount is excessive. I notice the Department of Justice is of the opinion that \$20,000 would be the correct amount for the injuries sustained, and that the Army suggests \$30,000. Fifty thousand dollars did look a little large to me. Personally, I do not object to the consideration of the bill. I believe that if the sum involved were \$30,000 it would stand a better chance of being passed by the Congress and signed by the President. I fear that if we pass the bill providing for \$50,000, when it reaches the President's desk he will call on the Army for an opinion, and they will say \$50,000 is excessive. I shall not object further, but I wanted to bring these facts to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I withdraw any objection that I might

have, because I have no personal interest in the bill at all. I felt it was an obligation, in my position of responsibility for the moment, to object because of the objection made at the last call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Reserving the right to object, I want to compliment the Senator from Minnesota for withdrawing his objection. We went over this matter in the greatest detail. The chairman called upon various experts, and, in my opinion, the amount involved is far, far too small. Here is a 4-year-old child who will be blind for the remainder of his life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, Mao Tse-tung in Peking and Josef Stalin in Moscow must have received great satisfaction at the action taken by the President of the United States in removing Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his position.

General MacArthur was a rock of Gibraltar against the further spread of communism in the East.

I invite the attention of the Senate to a story printed in this morning's New York Times by Mr. Walter H. Waggoner, stating that Great Britain has requested of the State Department of the United States that Red China be consulted on a Japanese peace treaty, and that, ultimately, if not now, the island of Formosa be turned over to Chinese Communists.

Mr. President, I do not know that my voice will carry as far as Formosa, but for the 8,000,000 free people on that island I wish to say that the groups which have been willing to sacrifice General MacArthur in Europe and in the United States will not hesitate to sacrifice the human liberties of 8,000,000 persons on the island of Formosa. They had better place their faith in the Lord and in their own strong right arm in order to defend their liberties from the betrayal which is in the making.

Mr. President, this morning I issued a brief statement which I wish to read into the RECORD:

By his action the President has yielded to British and American critics of General MacArthur. Our position in Japan and the whole Far East is placed in jeopardy by an action which most observers will interpret as a preliminary step to a far-eastern Munich. It is also a great victory for Secretary of State Acheson and his far-eastern policies. When General MacArthur arrives home the American people will have the opportunity to demonstrate to the world and to the President the high regard they have for MacArthur and his service to his country.

Mr. President, I predict that all over this land in every community in which General MacArthur may stop there will be such an outpouring that not even the White House will be able to misinterpret the sentiments of the American people.

JAMES SHELLENBERGER, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 699?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 699) for the relief of James Shellenberger, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor, of Mishawaka, Ind., the sum of \$50,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the injury of said James M. Shellenberger, Jr., which resulted in the permanent loss of sight in his left eye, the partial loss of sight in his right eye, and facial disfigurement, caused by the use of an improper solution of silver nitrate in the eyes of said infant at the time of his birth in the Sixty-first Station Hospital, United States Army, at Leghorn, Italy, on January 8, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor."

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 618) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard; the bill goes over.

#### EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS BELONGING TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 673) to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

#### DEATH OF LT. COL. JOHN UPSHUR DENNIS PAGE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I rise today to call to the attention of the Senate the death of Lt. Col. John Upshur Dennis Page, United States Army, who was killed in action December 11, 1950, in Korea.

Colonel Page was a scion of one of the most honored and oldest families of the State of Maryland. He died in defense of his country while voluntarily attempting to aid his fellow companions during an engagement near Koto-ri which the First Marines were defending.

I am proud to say that as a result of his efforts in attempting to defend a First Marine Division regimental train

ambushed by Chinese Reds, he has been recommended for the Congressional Medal of Honor by a Marine officer whom he assisted.

This Marine officer, Capt. George S. Petro, USMC, First Marines, has informed Colonel Page's widow of the valiant manner in which her husband met his death and of his intention of recommending the Congressional Medal of Honor. In his letter Captain Petro told the widow:

I was with Colonel Page the early morning he died. He gave his life to save others. My dear lady, your husband was a man, a hero. He almost single handedly cleared an enemy strong point that held up the column, he fought courageously; he died almost instantly.

I have recommended your husband for the Congressional Medal of Honor. I know he has earned it; I know he gave his life that others might live.

Colonel Page's actions were also highly commended by Lt. Col. R. W. Rickert, First Marine executive officer. He stated that "his energy and force in arranging artillery liaison planes to evacuate our wounded, his long hours on the bitter cold landing strip, supervising the extension of the strip, often under machine-gun and sniper fire, will long be remembered by all of us who were there."

Colonel Page's death came while he was attempting to have a machine gun set up during the ambush and he died after being hit by a rifle or machine-gun bullet.

Colonel Page, who was stationed at Jackson Barracks, New Orleans, La., before going overseas, came from a distinguished old Maryland family. One great grandfather was the Honorable John W. Crisfield, of Princess Anne, Md., for whom Crisfield is named. Among his other Maryland ancestors was Judge John Upshur Dennis, and his grandfather, Judge Henry Page, Maryland Court of Appeals. Lieutenant Colonel Page was the son of Col. Henry Page and Mrs. Edith Greenleaf Page, now residents of Mount Dora, Fla. In addition to his wife and parents, he is survived by his two children: Margaret Ann, born March 3, 1938, and Littleton Dennis, born February 3, 1941. His two brothers, Henry L. Page, Jr., 3301 North Charles Street, and Charles G. Page, 1112 Bryn Mawr Road, both live in Baltimore, Md. Lieutenant Colonel Page, who was 46 years old at the time of his death, commanded the Seven Hundred and Forty-sixth Field Artillery Battalion in the European theater in World War II.

I wish to express to the family of Colonel Page my deepest sympathy for their loss and I know I express the sentiments of the patriotic citizens of Maryland when I declare that my sorrow over Colonel Page's death is only exceeded by the pride he has inspired by his great sacrifice in the defense of his country.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 673?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill goes over.

#### SALE OF POST ROUTE AND RURAL DELIVERY MAPS, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 803) to authorize the sale of post route and rural delivery maps, opinions of the Solicitor, and transcripts of hearings before trial examiners, at rates to be determined by the Postmaster General, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment in line 9, after the word "reasonable", to insert a colon and "Provided, That such shall not be sold at a price that represents more than the cost thereof", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Postmaster General may authorize the sale of—

- (1) post route and rural delivery maps;
- (2) opinions of the Solicitor for the Post Office Department; and
- (3) transcripts of hearings before the trial examiners for the Post Office Department; at such rates as he determines to be fair and reasonable: *Provided*, That such shall not be sold at a price that represents more than the cost thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF DAM AND INCIDENTAL WORKS AT BRIDGE CANYON

The bill (S. 75) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

#### PROHIBITION OF SALE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF ROCKFISH WEIGHING MORE THAN 15 POUNDS

The bill (S. 41) prohibiting the sale in the District of Columbia of rockfish weighing more than 15 pounds, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### REPORTING OF CERTAIN DISEASES TO DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 260) to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to promulgate regulations requiring that cancer, sarcoma, lymphoma (including Hodgkin's disease), leukemia, and all other malignant growths be reported to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The reports of cases made pursuant to the provisions of regulations promulgated under this act shall be confidential and not open to public inspection. The information in such reports shall not be divulged or made public so as to disclose the identity of



any person to whom they may relate, except upon order of court, and unless already published shall be divulged or made public only on the written authorization of the Director of Public Health.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this act or regulations promulgated thereunder shall be construed to compel any person suffering from any of the diseases listed in section 1 to submit to medical examination or treatment.

Sec. 4. The said Commissioners are authorized to prescribe a reasonable penalty or fine, not to exceed \$100, for the violation of any regulation promulgated under the authority of this act, and all prosecutions for violations of such regulations shall be in the criminal branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia upon information filed by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants.

#### COMMITTAL OF CHILDREN TO BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE

The bill (S. 492) to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare; and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That no girl shall be committed to the National Training School for Girls after the enactment of this act. Any girl who, but for the provisions of this act, would be subject to commitment to such school shall be subject to commitment to the Board of Public Welfare (hereinafter called the Board). Girls committed to such school prior to the enactment of this act shall remain subject to the supervision and care of the Board for the periods of their commitments, but may be removed by it to any other place of detention available to it. The Board is authorized to parole or discharge any girl committed to it or subject to its supervision as provided in this section. In the supervision and care of any such girl the Board is authorized, in its discretion, to use any public or private agency or institution, or private family home, either without expense or at a fixed rate of board.

Sec. 2. The buildings, grounds, and equipment of the National Training School for Girls shall be available for the care and training of children committed to the Board or received and accepted by it for care under the authority of this or any other act. Appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for the National Training School for Girls shall be available for the care and training of such children.

Sec. 3. Section 8 of the act entitled "An act revising and amending the various acts establishing and relating to the Reform School of the District of Columbia," approved May 3, 1876, as applicable to the Reform School for Girls of the District of Columbia (subsequently designated the National Training School for Girls) (31 Stat. 809; D. C. Code, sec. 32-908), as amended—

(1) by striking out "Reform School for Girls", wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "Board of Public Welfare";

(2) by striking out "to remain until she arrives at the age of 21 years unless sooner discharged by the board of trustees"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following: "Girls committed to the Board of Public Welfare may be committed for such periods as the courts may deem proper, subject to earlier discharge by the Board of

Public Welfare, but no girl shall be so committed for a period extending beyond her twenty-first birthday."

Sec. 4. Clause (2) of section 14 of the act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," approved March 19, 1906, is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "National Training School for Girls or the"; and

(2) by striking out the word "schools" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "school."

#### DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 944) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, is the bill objected to?

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

#### CONSERVATION OF ASSETS OF CERTAIN INCAPACITATED PERSONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 11) to provide for the appointment of committees to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, or physical incapacity which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That if a person residing in or having property in the District of Columbia is unable, by reason of advanced age, mental weakness (not amounting to unsoundness of mind), or physical incapacity properly to care for his property, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may, upon his petition or the sworn petition of one or more of his relatives or friends, appoint some fit person to be conservator of his property.

Sec. 2. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall fix a time and place for a hearing thereon; and shall cause at least 14 days' notice thereof to be given to the person for whom a conservator is sought to be appointed if he is not the petitioner, and to such other persons as the court shall direct. The court in its discretion may appoint some disinterested person to act as guardian ad litem in any proceeding hereunder. Upon a finding that such person is incapable of caring for his property, the court shall appoint a conservator who shall have the charge and management of the property of such person subject to the direction of the court.

Sec. 3. Such conservator before entering upon the discharge of his duties shall execute an undertaking with surety to be approved by the court in such maximum amount as the court may order, conditioned on the faithful performance of his duties as such conservator; and he shall have control of the estate, real and personal, of the person for whom he has been appointed conservator, with power to collect all debts due such person, and upon authority of the court to adjust and settle all accounts owing by him, and to sue and be sued in his representative capacity. He shall apply such part of the annual income, and such part of the principal as the court may authorize, of the estate of such person to the support of such person, and the maintenance and education of his family and children; and shall in all other respects perform the same duties and have the same rights and powers with respect to the property of such person as have guardians of the estates of infants.

Sec. 4. When any person for whom a conservator has been appointed under the pro-

visions of this act shall become competent to manage his property, he may apply to such court to have such conservator discharged and to be restored to the care and control of his property. If the court finds him to be competent, an order shall be entered restoring the care and control of his property to such person. The court shall have the same powers with respect to the property of any person for whom a conservator has been appointed as it has with respect to the property of infants under guardianships.

Sec. 5. Upon filing of a petition as provided by this act the court may, with or without notice or hearing, appoint a temporary conservator of the estate of any person hereunder, if it deems such action necessary for the protection of such estate, subject to the provisions for an undertaking contained in section 3 hereof. Such temporary conservator shall serve only until such time as a permanent conservator can be appointed or until sooner discharged.

Sec. 6. Where a conservator is appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act, all contracts and business transactions, subsequent to the filing of the petition, of a person for whom a conservator has been appointed hereunder, shall be presumed to be a fraud upon him and against his rights and interests.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the appointment of conservators to conserve the assets of persons of advanced age, mental weakness, not amounting to unsoundness of mind, or physical incapacity."

#### APPREHENSION AND DETENTION OF INSANE PERSONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 263) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire whether the right of hearing or notice of hearing is accorded the persons involved in this type of proceeding?

Mr. PASTORE. It is.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "the first sentence of"; and on page 2, line 11, after the word "question.", to insert: "No certificate alleging the insanity of any person shall be valid which has been issued by a physician who is financially interested in the hospital or asylum in which the alleged insane person is to be confined; nor, except in the case of physicians employed by the United States or the District of Columbia, shall any such certificate be valid which has been issued by a physician who is professionally or

officially connected with such hospital or asylum", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended (sec. 21-330, D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), is hereby amended to read:

"That for the purpose of this act no certificate as to the sanity or the insanity of any person shall be valid which has been issued (a) by a physician who has not been regularly licensed to practice medicine in the District of Columbia, unless he be a commissioned surgeon of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, or Public Health Service, or a physician employed by the Veterans' Administration; or (b) by a physician who is related by blood or by marriage to the person whose mental condition is in question. No certificate alleging the insanity of any person shall be valid which has been issued by a physician who is financially interested in the hospital or asylum in which the alleged insane person is to be confined; nor, except in the case of physicians employed by the United States or the District of Columbia, shall any such certificate be valid which has been issued by a physician who is professionally or officially connected with such hospital or asylum."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

#### REGULATION OF BARBERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 573) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to increase the basic rate of compensation of members of the Board of Barber Examiners from \$9 to \$20 a day.

The bill would also require the posting of a list of prices for services rendered, and would change the penalty from a minimum of \$25 to a maximum of \$200. Parenthetically, I may say that at the present time no maximum penalty is provided for a violation of this section of the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 622), be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 12. The Commissioners are authorized and directed to provide suitable quarters for the Board. The compensation of each member of the Board, other than the secretary-treasurer, shall be fixed by the Commissioners at not to exceed \$20 for each day ac-

tually and necessarily spent in their duties as such members: *Provided*, That the total compensation payable to each such member shall not exceed \$600 per annum. The Commissioners are also authorized and directed to appoint such clerks, inspectors, and other personnel as they deem to be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That such inspectors shall be qualified barbers, each of whom shall have been engaged in the practice of barbering in the District of Columbia for a period of 5 years immediately prior to their appointment and shall be appointed after a competitive examination held for said positions by the Board. Compensation of such clerks, inspectors, and other personnel, including the secretary-treasurer of the Board, shall be fixed by the Commissioners. Payments for expenses of the Board, including those authorized by this section, shall not exceed the amount received from the fees provided for in this act; and if at the close of any fiscal year there be any funds unexpended in excess of the sum of \$1,000 such excess shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That no expense incurred under this act shall be a charge against the funds of the United States or the District of Columbia."

Sec. 2. Subsection (B) of section 14 of such act is amended by striking therefrom "not less than \$25" and inserting in lieu thereof "not more than \$200."

Sec. 3. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized by regulation to require the owner or the manager of every barber shop in the District of Columbia to post on a sign or signs the prices of services rendered to the public and they may specify in such regulations the sizes of the sign or signs, the lettering thereon, and the location thereof upon which prices are required to be posted. The Commissioners are further authorized to prescribe in such regulations that for each violation thereof there may be imposed a fine not exceeding \$200.

Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second month following its enactment.

#### STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY REPORTS OF COMMITTEES OF CONFERENCE

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1) directing that there shall accompany every report of a committee of conference a statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the committee was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there shall accompany every report of a committee of conference a statement, in writing and signed by at least a majority of the managers on the part of each House, explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the committee.

Sec. 2. The foregoing section shall be a rule of each House, respectively, and shall supersede any other rule thereof but only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such other rule.

#### CONTINUATION OF CLERICAL HELP ON PAYROLL OF SENATE UPON RESIGNATION OF A SENATOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 5) providing for the continuation of clerical and other assistants on the payroll of the Senate upon the resignation of a Senator, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 5, after the word "days", to insert "such sums to be paid

from the contingent fund of the Senate," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That in the case of the resignation of a Senator during his term of office, his clerical and other assistants on the payroll of the Senate on the date of such resignation shall be continued on such payroll at their respective salaries for a period of not to exceed 30 days, such sums to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate: *Provided*, That any such assistants continued on the payroll, while so continued, shall perform their duties under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, and he hereby is authorized and directed to remove from such payroll any such assistants who are not attending to the duties for which their services are continued: *Provided further*, That this shall not operate to continue such assistants on such payroll beyond the expiration of their Senator's term of service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF MINORS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 672) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the first sentence of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928, as amended (D. C. Code, secs. 36-201 to 36-227), is amended by striking out "48" and inserting in lieu thereof "40."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of such act is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following: "No minor under 16 years of age shall be employed in, about, or in connection with any manufacturing or mechanical establishment at any time on any manufacturing or mechanical process or operation."

Sec. 3. This act shall become effective 60 days after enactment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is called for.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this bill would lower the maximum number of hours from 48 to 40 which any minor under 18 years of age may work in any week in the District of Columbia, and would forbid the employment of any minor under 16 years of age on any mechanical or manufacturing process or operation. This is to protect their safety and the safety of others, as lives may be endangered by the use of minors on such machinery or process.

The bill would not change the age requirements for home delivery of newspapers, or store vending, and will permit the employment of minors who have completed the eighth grade of school in nonmechanical operations in industrial plants, such as in employment as clerks and office boys.

The bill was amended after protracted hearings, and it was favorably acted upon by the members of the committee. Their vote, after the proper amendments were made, was unanimous.



Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator, and I withhold the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### GRANT OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution favors the granting of the status of permanent residence by the Attorney General in the cases of certain aliens who are embraced as displaced persons under the Displaced Persons Act. The Displaced Persons Act provides that if the Attorney General shall, upon consideration of all the facts and circumstances of each case, determine that an alien has been of good moral character for the preceding 5 years and that such alien is qualified under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, the Attorney General shall report to the Congress all the pertinent facts in the case. The act further provides that if the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the granting of the status of permanent residence to such alien, the Attorney General is authorized to record the admission of the alien for permanent residence into the United States. Each case included in the concurrent resolution has been carefully reviewed by the staff of the committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. To what extent, if any, does this measure involve the question of naturalization?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, has the Department of Justice recommended the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. It is here on the recommendation of the Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

#### TU DO CHAU

The bill (S. 362) for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence

to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

#### SISTER BERTHA PFEIFFER AND SISTER ELZBIETA ZABINSKA

The bill (S. 470) for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

#### JOSEPH BERNSTEIN

The bill (S. 473) for the relief of Joseph Bernstein was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a companion House bill. It is Calendar 181, House bill 1479.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 1479 in lieu of Senate bill 473?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1479), an act for the relief of Joseph Bernstein, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 473 is indefinitely postponed.

#### CLAIM OF ALVIN SMITH, OF NEW CASTLE, DEL.

The bill (H. R. 599) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### LA FAYETTE BREWERY, INC.

The bill (H. R. 1249) for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CAPT. MARCIANO O. GARCES

The bill (H. R. 1682) for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### PETER E. KOLESNIKOFF

The bill (S. 953) for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in this case there is a companion House bill, Calendar No. 180, House bill 2918. It is not an identical bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 2918 in lieu of Senate bill 953?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2918) for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada wish to offer the committee amendment reported by the committee to the Senate bill as an amendment to the House bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, Mr. President. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of" it is proposed to strike out "\$1,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$766."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 953 is indefinitely postponed.

#### HARRY C. GOAKES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1822) for the relief of Harry C. Goakes which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$3,194.61" and insert "\$208.11."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### MRS. ROSE A. MONGRAIN—BILL PASSED OVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations, or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of United States district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment upon tort claims against the United States which accrue prior to January 1, 1945, suit may be instituted at any time within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of tort claims against the United States, on the claim of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain, of Lowell, Mass., against the United States arising as a result of personal injuries sustained by her on June 15, 1944, when she fell on the floor of the lobby of the main post office building, in Lowell, Mass.: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment of the committee to the bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain be rejected so as to restore the language deleted by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the House bill.

I ask to be recognized, Mr. President. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Paul R. Foisy, of Lowell, Mass., attorney for Mrs. Mongrain, has furnished me with the following brief statement in support of the action which I here propose:

Mrs. Mongrain entered the post office on June 15, 1944, to mail a package by parcel post. As she turned around to leave, there are double doors leading to the exterior of the premises, and as she opened one of the doors she fell to the hard floor caused by her feet sliding on some foreign substance which was very oily and greasy. How long the substance had been there, we cannot state, but a custodian was in the process of cleaning up the fluid at the time that this accident happened. We contend that there was negligence on the part of the officials by not warning any of the patrons of the post office that this condition was being remedied. Mrs. Mongrain was hospitalized for a considerable period of time as a result of injuries to her back. In view of the fact that though this accident happened several years ago, she still has pains in the lumbar region on damp and rainy days.

Under the Senate version of the bill it would simply give her a right of act to bring suit against the Government which would probably not be heard for at least 2 or 3 years from now or after the passage of the bill. The claim has been introduced in the House by Mrs. ROGERS since fall, although it will not compensate her for expenses and suffering.

The statement (in the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary) to the effect that Mrs. Mongrain saw the custodian washing the floor before she fell was incorrect. Mrs. Mongrain did see the custodian washing the floor, but only after she fell and after she had opened the door leading to the exterior of the building.

I have also received a letter from the beneficiary of the bill, Mrs. Mongrain. This letter is dated March 26, 1951, and reads as follows:

This is in reference to H. R. 597, Calendar No. 179, of the Eighty-second Congress, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain, 81 Dalton Street, Lowell, Mass.

This bill was presented to the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for the second time only to be struck out again, bringing matters back to where they were 2 years ago. It is now 7 years since that accident happened and I, the victim, have been made to wait all these years with disappointing news with each succeeding year.

I would therefore beseech you to bear all pressure on this committee so that the bill H. R. 857 may not be changed but may be presented to the committee as is for a favorable decision.

I may add parenthetically, Mr. President, that I did not receive this letter until after the Committee on the Judiciary had reported the bill to the Senate. Mrs. Mongrain continues:

I have been compelled to pay all the medical and hospital bills arising as a result of the accident and that I am still under the doctor's care as a result of the same accident.

I was also compelled because of my ailing condition to sacrifice my business (beauty parlor of 432 Suffolk Street) and thus suffer additional hardships.

For all these reasons I trust that you will do everything within your power to give me this much needed assistance.

I quote now from the House Judiciary Committee report on this claim, as follows:

The post office inspector, O. R. Horne, states in his findings that he was satisfied

the claimant in this case did suffer an injury on Government property through no negligence on her part. \* \* \* There certainly was negligence on the part of the post office officials in not keeping patrons from the area which was being mopped at the time of Mrs. Mongrain's accident.

I hope the amendment of the committee will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. LANGER. I withhold my objection, but I wish to say to the Senator that I shall object, because I want the matter investigated further. After a bill has been considered as carefully as this bill was by the Committee on the Judiciary, and after the matter has been pending for 7 years, I do not believe it should be amended on the floor, but should go back to the committee for further study. I shall therefore ask that the bill go over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator withhold his request for a moment, please?

Mr. LANGER. I withhold the request.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill was passed by the House and came to the Senate. The bill carried an amount of \$2,500. The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate gave considerable study to the bill. The question involved was as to the real cause of the injury; as to whether there was contributory negligence or not, and it was the unanimous decision of the committee, as the Senator from North Dakota will recall, that the least we could do was to give the woman the right to sue.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Post Office Department had denied the claimant administrative relief on the ground that the evidence submitted did not establish the responsibility of the Government. The committee did not feel that it could determine the claim properly on the evidence submitted to it. However, the committee, of which the Senator from North Dakota is a member, felt that the claimant should have the right to sue.

The woman was undoubtedly injured by a fall in the lobby of the Post Office. It seems, as we view it, it would not be out of place, in view of the fact that the House granted the amount carried in the bill after study, that the Senate join in the action of the House. If I had the opportunity to do so, I would accept the House version.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

#### CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO OGDEN (UTAH) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The bill (S. 952) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the Ogden (Utah) Chamber of Commerce was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that there is on the calendar a companion bill, House bill 3040, Calendar 188. I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill, and that the Senate proceed to consider the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3040) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Ogden, Utah, to the Ogden Chamber of Commerce was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 952 is indefinitely postponed.

#### TRANSFER OF LANDS TO POLICE JURY OF PARISH OF RAPIDES, LA.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the police jury of the parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural expositions was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That, upon the written consent of the Louisiana Rural Rehabilitation Corp., the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed or other appropriate means to the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College so much of the right, title, and interest held by the United States in and to the lands transferred to such board of supervisors pursuant to the act entitled "An act to transfer certain lands situated in Rapides Parish, La., to board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College" (Public Law 148, 79th Cong.) as may be necessary to permit such board to convey 25 acres of such land to the Policy Jury of the Parish of Rapides for use for the sole purpose of holding livestock and agricultural expositions thereon.*

Sec. 2. The transfer of such lands shall not be deemed to impose any liability upon the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to his obligations under the transfer agreements with the Louisiana Rural Rehabilitation Corporation.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### TERMS OF LEASES OF ARIZONA STATE-OWNED LANDS

The bill (S. 108) to amend sec. 28 of the enabling act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish the Senate could be given an explanation of the bill. It seems to be a complicated measure, and an explanation of it should be made for the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this is a bill to amend the enabling act of the State of Arizona. It deals with restrictions which were imposed by the Federal Government in the Arizona Enabling Act, by which the new State was granted for State purposes some 10,-



500,000 acres of the 72,691,000 acres within her borders.

Mr. President, it has been found that the enabling act is too restrictive in regard to the making of long-term leases of land for exploration for oil. This measure would merely make the requirements in that respect accord with the provisions which have been made by the State legislature. The amendment merely conforms to the amendments which have been made for New Mexico and other areas.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Under this bill, if enacted, the land could be leased for 20 years instead of 10 years. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the same amendment we have made for the State of New Mexico would be made in this case. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the enactment of this bill will involve some cost.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I think not.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Then, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 108) to amend section 28 of the enabling act for the State of Arizona relating to the terms of leases of State-owned lands, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 24, after the word "less", to strike out the comma and "without advertisement"; and on page 3, line 5, after the word "less", to strike out the comma and "without advertisement", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the third paragraph of section 28 of the act entitled "An act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," approved June 20, 1910, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"No mortgage or other encumbrance of the said lands, or any part thereof, shall be valid in favor of any person or for any purpose or under any circumstances whatsoever. Said lands shall not be sold or leased, in whole or in part, except to the highest and best bidder at a public auction to be held at the county seat of the county wherein the lands to be affected, or the major portion thereof, shall lie, notice of which public auction shall first have been duly given by advertisement, which shall set forth the nature, time, and place of the transaction to be had, with a full description of the lands to be offered, and be published once each week for not less than 10 successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation published regularly at the State capital, and in that newspaper of like circulation which shall then be regularly published nearest to the location of the lands so offered; nor shall any sale or contract for the sale of any timber or other natural product of such lands be made, save at the place,

in the manner, and after the notice by publication provided for sales and leases of the lands themselves. Nothing herein contained shall prevent: (1) the leasing of any of the lands referred to in this section, in such manner as the Legislature of the State of Arizona may prescribe, for grazing, agricultural, commercial, and homestead purposes, for a term of 10 years or less; (2) the leasing of any of said lands, in such manner as the Legislature of the State of Arizona may prescribe, whether or not also leased for grazing and agricultural purposes, for mineral purposes, other than for the exploration, development, and production of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances, for a term of 20 years or less; or (3) the leasing of any of said lands, whether or not also leased for other purposes, for the exploration, development, and production of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon substances on, in, or under said lands for an initial term of 20 years or less and as long thereafter as oil, gas, or other hydrocarbon substance may be procured therefrom in paying quantities, the leases to be made in any manner, with or without advertisement, bidding, or appraisalment, and under such terms and provisions as the Legislature of the State of Arizona may prescribe, the terms and provisions to include a reservation of a royalty to said State of not less than 12½ percent of production."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FMLOYMENT OF RETIRED OFFICERS OR WARRANT OFFICERS BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 927) to amend section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 2, line 3, after the word "officer", to insert "or warrant officer"; in line 6, after the word "elect", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That upon appointment under the authorities of this subsection, or any other authority of law, officers or warrant officers retired for injuries or incapacities incurred in line of duty may, in addition to the elections set forth herein, elect to receive, in addition to their retired pay, additional compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which the compensation of their position with the Agency exceeds their retired pay"; in line 16, after the word "officers", to insert "or warrant officers"; and in line 17, after the word "law", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That, upon such appointment, officers retired for injuries or incapacity incurred in line of duty may, in addition to the elections set forth above, elect to receive, in addition to their retired pay, annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which the compensation of their position with the Agency exceeds their retired pay", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (act of June 20, 1949, ch. 227, sec. 6, 63 Stat. 211) is hereby amended by the addition of a subsection "(f)" as follows:

"(f) (1) Notwithstanding section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended (5 U. S. C. A. 62), or any other law prohibiting the employment of any retired commissioned or warrant officer of the armed services, the Agency is hereby authorized to

employ and to pay the compensation of not more than 15 retired officers or warrant officers of the armed services while performing service for the Agency, but while so serving such retired officer or warrant officer will be entitled to receive only the compensation of his position with the Agency, or his retired pay, whichever he may elect: *Provided*, That upon appointment under the authorities of this subsection, or any other authority of law, officers or warrant officers retired for injuries or incapacities incurred in line of duty may, in addition to the elections set forth herein, elect to receive, in addition to their retired pay, additional compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which the compensation of their position with the Agency exceeds their retired pay.

"(2) Nothing in this section shall limit or affect the appointment of and payment of compensation to retired officers or warrant officers not presently or hereafter prohibited by law."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AGREEMENT BETWEEN SECRETARIES OF ARMED SERVICES AND THE COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES WITH RESPECT TO ACQUISITION OR DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PROPERTY—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 285) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for an explanation of the bill; and also I wish to ask whether this bill, if enacted, would put the Congress into the business of administering, rather than legislating.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the present time, and since 1944, all leases and real estate transactions of the Navy come to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Armed Services Committee of the House. If no action by way of disapproval is taken by them, then such leases or real estate transactions may be consummated within a certain period of days.

If such a procedure is correct in the case of the Navy, in my opinion, during the present period of great Government activity, particularly with respect to the acquisition of land by the Government, it should apply to the Army and to the Air Force, as well. On the other hand, if such procedure is not proper, it should not be permitted on the part of the Navy.

This bill has been considered by the Committee on Armed Services, and in its present form is acceptable to that committee.

The bill, if enacted, would require the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration to submit for agreement by the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House the following categories of real estate transactions:

First. The acquisition of real property where fee title is to be acquired.

Second. All leases to the United States of real property having an annual rental in excess of \$10,000.

Third. Leases of Government-owned real property where the annual rental is in excess of \$10,000, leases for agricultural or grazing purposes being exempted from this requirement.

Fourth. All transfers of Government-owned real property under jurisdiction of any of the enumerated departments to other Federal agencies or States, excluding transfers between the military departments.

Fifth. All reports of excess Government-owned real property to a disposal agency.

In connection with the foregoing, let me point out that at the present time the Navy has to report even in the case of the rental of an automobile garage for 1 month for as little as \$7. This bill, if enacted, will relieve the Navy of that obligation.

The purpose of the bill is to require real estate transactions of the sort I have mentioned to be submitted to the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses, in order to give them an opportunity to examine some of the very extensive land acquisitions and leases which are being made.

For instance, recently we have heard about the proposed leasing of two apartment houses in Washington. That was stopped by the House Committee on Armed Services, and now the Army is going to make other arrangements.

When the Armed Services are acquiring or wish to acquire so much new real estate, this measure, if enacted, would give us an opportunity to look over the situation. If we had no objection, the Armed Services could proceed.

At the present time, under the existing situation, we authorize additions or improvements; but when properties are leased, we do not follow up such transactions.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Does the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts feel that a time of, let us say, 10 days or 15 days should be incorporated in this measure, before it could become effective?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So far as the Navy is concerned, I believe that point has never been raised. Some of the leases will require longer consideration than others, of course. It would be better not to place a time limit in the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Is it the purpose or the policy of the Senate Armed Services Committee, then, to report leases, or a series of leases, of that type to the Senate, thereby giving the other Members of this body an opportunity to object? If that is not done, does not the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that in many cases Senators having a legitimate right to object or desiring to object, never would know about such matters, if information concerning them remained in the bosom of only the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses of Congress?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Committee on Armed Services can always call such a matter to the attention of the Senate, as of course is often done. I myself have done so in connection with Navy leases where large amounts were involved. Of course it would not be possible to have the Senate pass on all the leases; that would take too much time.

We simply wish to give the Congress an opportunity to take a second look at what it already has authorized.

For instance, in one case—I speak now in round figures, and they are not strictly accurate—we authorized the purchase of land at, let us say, \$500,000. I think the actual amount was somewhat more than that. That authorization applied to a specific piece of property. Subsequently, \$1,500,000 was asked for the same piece of property, for which previously \$500,000 had been asked. That is the sort of thing the committee would like to have an opportunity to look at again and consider.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I appreciate the situation. In these times when there is so much hurry and rush and desire for speed, and sometimes a desire on the part of those who have valuable property to dump it on the Government of the United States, I think it is most important that we have those checks and those balances, and that we be notified or apprised, certainly, of what is going on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota withhold his objection for a moment, or will he inform me why he objects? I ask the question most respectfully, because if this bill is to be of any value to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, which now are acquiring great areas of land for new airports and new locations, we should either pass the bill or drop it altogether.

Mr. LANGER. The chief reason why I object is that the Navy already has almost unlimited power to make settlements involving millions of dollars. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] time and time again has stated on the floor of the Senate that the Maritime Commission has sold vessels which have been insured for more than the amount for which they were sold.

Very frankly, I do not know enough about this bill to warrant my permitting it to be passed, without making further investigation. Therefore, I object to the passage of the bill at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say most respectfully to the Senator from North Dakota that representatives of the Navy now must come before these committees of Congress, to submit to them the leases for all real estate they intend to lease, even down to the renting of a garage for one automobile in a city in North Dakota.

This bill attempts to do for the Army and the Air Force what is now required of the Navy. In the case of the Navy, we now have, and have had for the past

several years, an opportunity to go over every realty transaction. This measure has no application to personal property, such as ships, or anything of that sort.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that. Let me say that only last week the Committee on the Judiciary turned down the request of one of the departments of our State government which wanted authority to settle claims up to \$1,000,000. That request was turned down by the Senate Judiciary Committee because of the very fact—and it was referred to—that the Navy had this power. The department of the State wanted the same rights the Navy has. We felt that the time had come to put a stop to that procedure until we can make a more thorough investigation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This measure has nothing to do with settlements of any kind.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that; but it has to do with leases, and some of them may be quite valuable.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that this is an effort to try to get a second look at such leases. Now, the Navy has to show to the two Committees on the Armed Services its lease on every single garage rented for 1 month. The Air Force can buy real estate costing from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 without showing anything to the Armed Services Committees. This is an effort to give us an opportunity to look at acquisitions which are to be made by the Air Force and the Army. It is the reverse of what the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is saying.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts has no objection to the Senator from North Dakota having another opportunity to look at this bill, so that we may take it up the next time it is called.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts this question: Recently the Air Force moved into my home town of Wichita, and proceeded under some type of authority to take over property worth millions of dollars, despite the fact that within my State there were seven or eight other inactivated air bases, paid for by the taxpayers, which could have been used. Had this bill been on the statute books at that time, would it have required the Air Force to come to the Congress for and obtain an authorization for an installation of that type, specifying the amount to be expended?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I may ask the Senator from Kansas a question, Did the property to which he refers belong to the Air Force?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. It did not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I may say that, as I understand, it would come directly within the purview of this bill, and it would be necessary for the Air Force to come before the Congress to request the necessary authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?



Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not true that the settlements which the Navy has been able to make under existing legislation in connection with the acquisition of real estate must be reported to the Congress?

Mr. LANGER. The committee desires to find out about it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not required by law?

Mr. LANGER. My understanding is that it is not required.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. My understanding is that such settlements are required to be reported to the Congress, under specific law, and I thought the RECORD should show that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1220) to authorize the appointment of Bernt Balchen as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, it has just been called to my attention that, while I was conversing with the Senator from North Dakota, Calendar No. 189, Senate bill 1220, was objected to. I respectfully ask by whom was the objection made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). It was objected to by the present occupant of the chair.

#### GRAND CANYON PARK SOUTH APPROACH HIGHWAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 109) to protect scenic values along the Grand Canyon Park South Approach Highway (State 64) within the Kaibab National Forest, Arizona, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word "Section", to strike out "6" and insert "19", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That hereafter mining locations made under the mining laws of the United States within the following-described lands within the Kaibab National Forest, Coconino County, Ariz.:

Sections 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, 23, and 26, township 22 north, range 2 east;

Sections 1, 12, and 13, township 28 north, range 2 east;

Sections 1, 12, 13, 24, 25, and 36, township 29 north, range 2 east;

Sections 13, 24, 25, and 36, township 30 north, range 2 east;

Section 18, township 30 north, range 3 east;

Sections 12 and 13, township 30 north, range 5 east;

Sections 7, 18, 19, 29, 30, 32, and 33, township 30 north, range 6 east;

Sections 3 and 4, township 29 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River Base and meridian; shall confer on the locator the right to occupy and use so much of the surface of the land covered by the location as may be reasonably necessary to carry on prospecting,

mining, and beneficiation of ores, including the taking of mineral deposits and timber required by or in the mining and ore-reducing operations, and no permit shall be required or charge made for such use or occupancy: *Provided, however,* That the cutting and removal of timber, except where clearing is necessary in connection with mining operations or to provide space for buildings or structures used in connection with mining operations, shall be conducted in accordance with the rules for timber cutting on adjoining national-forest land, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining and prospecting shall be allowed except under the national-forest rules and regulations, nor shall the locator prevent or obstruct other occupancy of the surface or use of surface resources under authority of national-forest regulations, or permits issued thereunder, if such occupancy or use is not in conflict with mineral development.

SEC. 2. That hereafter all patents issued under the United States mining laws affecting lands within the above-described area shall convey title to the mineral deposits within the claim, together with the right to cut and remove so much of the mature timber therefrom as may be needed in extracting and removing and beneficiation of the mineral deposits, if the timber is cut under sound principles of forest management as defined by the national-forest rules and regulations, but each patent shall reserve to the United States all title in or to the surface of the lands and products thereof, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining or prospecting shall be allowed except under the rules and regulations of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. That valid mining claims within the said lands, existing on the date of the enactment of this act, and thereafter maintained in compliance with the law under which they were initiated and the laws of the State of Arizona, may be perfected under this act, or under the laws under which they were initiated, as the claimant may desire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of the calendar.

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1951

The resolution (S. Res. 76) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. AIKEN. What resolution is that?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1951. I ask unanimous consent that it be made the unfinished business of the Senate, for consideration tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### BARKLEY DAY CELEBRATION IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues a highly successful celebration of Barkley Day which was held in the city of Philadelphia on March 29.

The affair was planned and carried out by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia in honor of the distin-

guished President of this body, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

It was a sincere civic tribute to the Vice President of the United States. The participants included representatives of many civic, educational, and commercial organizations, members of the consular corps and veterans groups.

The theme of the celebration was recognition of Vice President BARKLEY as a living example of the opportunities afforded every young person in this great country.

It placed emphasis on his distinguished career of service to the Nation as an inspiration to the youth of our land.

In commemoration of this well-deserved tribute the Junior Chamber of Commerce presented to the Vice President a beautifully framed scroll inscribed as follows:

BARKLEY DAY, MARCH 29, 1951, IN HONOR OF ALBEN W. BARKLEY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Because of the inspiration his life offers to young people everywhere, we of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia dedicate this day to him and to the American spirit of achievement which he typifies.

Presented in the city of Philadelphia on Barkley Day, March 29, 1951.

HAROLD M. MYERS,

President.

ANTHONY M. SWARTZ,

Chairman,

International Relations Committee.

DAVID SINAIK,

Barkley Day Chairman.

#### DISPERSAL OF CERTAIN VITAL FEDERAL AGENCIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 218) to authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of, and accessible to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 216) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the bill I have just reported provides a program to disperse the vital Federal agencies outside the District of Columbia so that the Government of the United States may continue to function regardless of any calamity or disaster which might conceivably befall the District.

In submitting this report I ask the Senators who are present to please familiarize themselves with the bill and the report, as I am advised by the distinguished majority leader that he expects to give this measure an early opportunity to be heard on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Could the Senator be more specific as to when the bill may be brought before the Senate? I was under the impression at the committee meeting that it was rather imminent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry I cannot answer that question categorically. The distinguished majority leader, who is not in the Chamber at the moment, advised

the Senator from Florida yesterday that two measures would be given preferred status, one of which is the resolution on the subject of reorganization of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; the other, this so-called dispersal bill. The Senator from Florida does not know that the present plans of the majority leader may be as to the order in which the two measures will be considered.

Mr. CASE. As the Senator knows, the committee acted under the impression that the measure was likely to be called up this week, presumably tomorrow. If the Senator could give that information to Members of the Senate, I thought it might perhaps be of assistance to them in making their plans.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota. It is correct that the Senator from Arizona, the distinguished majority leader, advised the Senator from Florida that he wanted to have the two measures considered at an early date, if possible, and that the Senate might proceed to the consideration of one of them tomorrow. Unless I misunderstood the majority leader, he stated a few minutes ago that he expected to take up first the reorganization resolution. I do not know how soon after that this bill will come up, but I understand that its consideration is imminent and that it will be brought up as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution (S. Res. 76) has been made the unfinished business of the Senate.

#### TRANSFER OF LANDS IN ADDISON COUNTY, VT., TO THE VERMONT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, referring to calendar order No. 81, the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, in accordance with notice previously given, I move that the Senate proceed to its consideration. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture some weeks ago, and on a previous call was objected to by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I have tried to find some convenient time when the Senator could be on the floor, at which time I might move the consideration of this bill, but I have been unable to do so. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill at this time. As I understand, the Senator from Oregon may be absent for several days yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 271.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to

transfer and convey to the Vermont Agricultural College, a State-owned corporation, upon acceptance by said agricultural college, without cost, the real property comprising nine hundred forty-two and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, of the United States Morgan Horse Farm located in Addison County, town of Weybridge, Vt., and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College. Such real and personal property and research records shall be transferred upon the express condition that they shall be used by the Vermont Agricultural College for the benefit of agriculture for such period as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the said college at the time of transfer. Deeds to the property conveyed pursuant to this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other minerals and all fissionable materials as may be found in such lands and the right to the use of the lands for extracting and removing same.

The authority herein contained shall expire on June 30, 1951, unless, prior to such expiration date, the dean of the Vermont Agricultural College shall have notified the Secretary of Agriculture of the acceptance of the lands and other property of the station under the terms of this act.

#### THE REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial entitled "The Firing of MacArthur," published in the Washington Evening Star of today. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a cablegram which my colleague [Mr. JENNER] and I sent to General MacArthur, and also a press release on the same subject which I issued today.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 11, 1951]

#### THE FIRING OF MACARTHUR

The dismissal of General MacArthur from his commands effectively asserts the authority of Mr. Truman as President and Commander in Chief. And when the matter is viewed only in this narrow focus, it does not appear that the President had any real alternative.

It is clear that General MacArthur had consistently and deliberately ignored or circumvented admonitions from his superior to hold his tongue. There is strong indication that he told Secretary of the Army Pace that he would continue to speak out on issues pertaining to far eastern policy in which he is in deep and fundamental disagreement with the President. In those circumstances, one of three things had to happen. General MacArthur could be relieved, he could resign, or the President could adopt General MacArthur's views as his own. The President chose to relieve the general, and it was not to be expected that Mr. Truman would adopt any other course.

But the firing of General MacArthur does nothing—absolutely nothing—to solve the main problem which brought about his dismissal. That problem remains on the Truman doorstep, and the people of this country should be very deeply concerned with what the President intends to do about it.

In his statement accompanying the announcement of the general's dismissal, Mr. Truman said that "full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of our free democracy." That comment should be taken with a grain of salt, for the documents re-

leased by the White House make it clear that the administration has tried to silence or censor not only General MacArthur but all of our military and diplomatic representatives. The intent was to prevent them from saying anything inconsistent with our national policy, and while there are obvious reasons for this the effect is to stifle full and vigorous debate by gagging all those who disagree with official policy. This is something that should be kept in mind during the furious controversy that will follow General MacArthur's dismissal, for it means that no official in active military or diplomatic service will be permitted to express his views if he happens to disagree with administration policy.

The firing of General MacArthur presumably disposes, for the time at least, of some of his differences with the President. Mr. Truman will continue his efforts to confine the war to Korea, to avoid a general engagement in Asia, and to concentrate our strength on shoring up the defenses of Western Europe. This is a policy that is advocated by most of our top military and diplomatic officials, and it is clamorously advocated by our associates in the U. N. Once again, looked at in narrow focus, the policy, despite General MacArthur's contrary views, seems sound. To say the least, our rearmament program has not advanced to the point at which we could safely undertake a general war in the Far East.

But neither this aspect of the problem, nor the question of civilian versus diplomatic authority, can be divorced from the grim fact that we are at war in Korea. And the overriding question is how that war can be brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

It is with respect to this question that Gen. MacArthur's position is strong, and the President's is weak. For General MacArthur at least had a program which offered some hope of winning the Korean war. He wanted to attack the Chinese with air power in their Manchurian sanctuary, to blockade their ports, and, evidently, to make some use of Chiang Kai-shek's 600,000 troops on the island of Formosa. Such a policy might have failed, and certainly would have involved grave risks. But it was also a policy which might have brought victory in Korea.

What is Mr. Truman's policy in this respect? He is opposed to the MacArthur measures, but there is no indication that he has any idea as to what might be done to win the Korean war. Neither have our associates in the United Nations. They were willing to fight the North Koreans, but they have been backing away ever since the Chinese Communists entered the war. Some of them show signs of willingness to settle on any terms they can get—even on terms that would stultify our motives in going to war and that would sell out the South Koreans. These allies will bear close watching in the days to come.

It is not in Mr. Truman's character to embrace such a settlement. But events will force him to some kind of a decision, for the indications are that the war is entering upon a phase of intolerable stalemate. Our Army cannot be kept there forever. Neither is it conceivable that it can be withdrawn on terms that would amount to a betrayal of the South Korean people who have suffered so much in the name of high moral purpose. Before the President has resolved this thorny dilemma he may well come to envy the commander whom he has seen fit to relieve of all responsibility in the matter.

APRIL 11, 1951.

General of the Army DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,  
Supreme Allied Headquarters,  
Tokyo, Japan:

Since you have agreed to come to the United States to address a joint session of the Congress you are also cordially invited and expressly urged to come to Indiana and



from this friendly and thoroughly American State tell the Nation and the world the facts concerning your participation in far-eastern hostilities and the facts which led to your dismissal from all commands by President Truman.

HOMER E. CAPEHART,  
United States Senator.  
WILLIAM E. JENNER,  
United States Senator.

#### STATEMENT OF SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART

Interests other than those of the American people and the American fighting men in Korea dictated the action of President Truman in the removal of General MacArthur.

The President's action is another—and the worst—in a long list of mistakes that have resulted from the stultifying international policies laid down by Dean Acheson and European influences.

General MacArthur's cry for help for our fighting men in Korea has been answered by a leadership that is stupefied by stubborn smugness and hopelessly bound in international ties.

Rather than to consult with General MacArthur on the Far East problem, of which he is most familiar, the President saw fit to dismiss this possible source of help in the formulation of a definite and sound Far East policy.

I am certain that this day will be marked in history in much the same manner as the day when other smug leadership chastised Patrick Henry for his challenge: "Give me liberty or give me death."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, like other Members of the Senate, I spent most of last night in receiving telephone calls because of the recall of General MacArthur. This morning I received many telegrams on the same subject, and I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD several such telegrams, together with my answers thereto.

There being no objection, the telegrams and replies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISMARCK, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Washington, D. C.:

I request that you immediately start or back any motion to have General MacArthur testify before Congress.

COLEMAN GLOVER.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Washington, D. C.:

MacArthur only man that knows the conditions. Why fire him to appease Communists? Serious thought should be given to impeaching Truman.

REED CLEANERS,  
HAROLD G. REED.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

As our Senator in Washington, demand your active opposition to Truman's action.

JOHN KIRK.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Demand your active opposition on Senate floor to MacArthur recall.

BOB LEWIS.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

MacArthur recall, if meant to unify the country, sad mistake. Strongly opposed.

C. H. ARNOLD.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We expect Downing Street and the Pravda to approve of MacArthur's recall. We do not.

A. R. BYERS AND FAMILY.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Truman's action is tragic; urge your active opposition.

G. S. AAMOTH.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Speak for a group of ten unanimous opposition to Truman's action re MacArthur.

WALTER VANVEGHEL.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Senate Office Building,

Strongly oppose Acheson's victory in recall of MacArthur. Decision may be popular in London but not in America.

MRS. ROBERT C. LEWIS.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 11, 1951.  
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Oppose the administration's recall MacArthur. Consensus on local opinion supports this view strongly.

ALMA LEWIS.

APRIL 11, 1951.

Following is copy of telegram to those received by Senator YOUNG protesting MacArthur removal: "Removal of General MacArthur by President Truman is one of the most tragic mistakes of all time. This apparently is in line with President Truman's and Secretary Dean Acheson's program of everlasting appeasement to Communists and their allies. Solely because of a bankrupt foreign policy, our boys are facing tremendous odds in their gallant fight against Communists. Meanwhile Acheson is permitted to continue his contemptible collaboration with nations most sympathetic to the Chinese Communist objective in the Orient. The present British Government, which apparently dictates much of Acheson's policy, seems more concerned about continuing their profitable trade relations with Communist China than they are about the Korean war. Acheson's removal long ago would have made possible the establishment of a realistic American policy and would have avoided this present debacle."

"MILTON R. YOUNG,  
United States Senator."

#### AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on February 8, I submitted Senate Resolution 72 to name a Committee of the Judiciary to make a full and complete study of the Trading With the Enemy Act and to report back to the Senate at the earliest possible date.

This resolution means simply to go into the complete operations of the Of-

fice of APC and Foreign Funds Control, the State Department, and other agencies that made the policies, which stripped not only the German people, who were not Nazis, of their assets throughout the world, but stripped American citizens of over \$70,000,000 in the estates and trusts that they set up for their relatives in the old country to be delivered to them after the war was over.

The disclosures, which I made on the Senate floor on January 29 and on February 5, in which I pointed out that the policies of the Office of Alien Property were the policies of the Kremlin carried out by Harry Dexter White and by Alger Hiss and their motley crew, are only a small part of the chicanery that has taken place.

I told the United States Senate that the master plan of the Kremlin for world aggression requires in all instances carefully prepared campaigns, often subtle, and often indirect; many times using causes, which in themselves are good, for evil ends, carried out over long periods of time without apparent connection, which have as their sole purpose the weakening of the will of the free people to resist Communist aggression, when the time is ripe. Let me repeat the latter part of that statement, so that we will remember it and will see how it is going to tie in with the further disclosures I am going to make today. The Kremlin master plan for aggression is to do everything to weaken the will of the free people to resist Communist aggression when the time is ripe.

Part of that plan was to get people to hate; hate each other, hate their own governments, create disunity, and to do everything possible to weaken the will of the free people to resist Communist aggression when the time is ripe.

In my previous statement on this floor I stated categorically that during the entire war even the Hitler government was prevented by fearless German lawyers from confiscating the interest of Americans as heirs to estates in Germany, and that in every instance trustees were appointed to look after such American interests.

No American citizen was divested of his title to any property in Germany, and no American was deprived of his right to inherit during the entire war and when the war was over American citizens received letters from the courts and from others in Germany stating that they were heirs to estates of people, who had died during the war, and that decrees of heirship to that effect had been issued by the German courts while the war was on. American citizens were not only found to be heirs and entitled to such inheritance but title to both real and personal property was transferred to them, and trustees were appointed to protect those American interests.

I charge that the Office of Alien Property knew all about this but it was not in accordance with the plans of Alger Hiss and the Harry Dexter White crowd to let the American people know about this, or to let the Congress know about it; and I go even further, I charge them with perpetrating frauds on the various

State courts and courts of the United States, and I intend to prove that charge now. We all remember that immediately after Pearl Harbor our State Department announced that the Swiss Government would look after all American interests in all enemy countries. That meant that the Swiss Government in every country with which the United States was at war, would protect American interests. On the other hand the Hitler government also appointed the Swiss Government to look after the interests of German nationals in enemy countries. The Japanese Government, the Bulgarian Government, and the Hungarian Government also appointed the Swiss Government in a similar capacity.

So the Swiss Government set up different departments, as far as the United States and German interests were concerned. The department was the Department of American Affairs of the Swiss Government; the other was the Department of German Affairs of the Swiss Government administered by their consuls and ministers. This arrangement was made in the case of the United States with the Swiss Government by our State Department. This was in complete accord with international law.

The work of the Department of American Affairs of the Swiss Government was to protect American interests in all enemy countries and to report back to the State Department and all other departments including the Treasury Department, Foreign Funds Control, and the Office of Alien Property on all matters involving American property interests, and they did so report back.

At any time then after Pearl Harbor until the Hitler government was destroyed the Office of Alien Property, the Treasury Department, the State Department had only to ask the Swiss Embassy, Department of American Affairs, for a report on any of these matters. But what did they do? Let us take a look at what they did. I am sure this will be of particular interest to my colleagues from the States of California, Washington, Arizona, Oregon, and others, which have State statutes requiring reciprocity in inheritance matters. So that we may all know what this is about and so there cannot be any question I will refer to just one of those statutes, the one that was passed in California. The others were patterned after the California statute. I refer now to section 259 of the Probate Code of California, which was originally enacted on July 4, 1941, 6 months before Pearl Harbor. Section 259 provided substantially that the right of nonresident aliens to inherit or take by will real or personal property in California is dependent upon existence of a reciprocal right of United States citizens to take real or personal property upon the same terms and conditions as residents and citizens of the respective countries of which such aliens are inhabitants and citizens, and upon the further right of United States citizens to receive by payment to them within the United States or its Territories money originating from the estates of

persons dying within such foreign countries.

Our United States Supreme Court had previously held in the case of Clark against Allen that the treaty between the United States and Germany, as far as reciprocity of inheritance was concerned covered real property, but that the treaty did not cover personal property, so the statute in California was inoperative as to real property because of the treaty, but was in full force and effect as far as personal property was concerned and this resulted in estate litigation all over California and those other States and this is still going on, but I say to you now that that litigation would have ended long ago and would all have been unnecessary except for the failure of the Office of Alien Property to bring the true facts before the courts.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor litigation started with reference to wills and trusts set up by American citizens for their relatives in Germany.

I may say, Mr. President, that some of the trusts were created by veterans, men who fought in the war, and who had relatives in Germany. Although they were fighting for the United States, although they were GI's, some of them had created trusts for their relatives residing in Germany.

(At this point Mr. LANGER yielded to Mr. MCCARTHY for the purpose of making a statement, which was ordered to be printed at the conclusion of Mr. LANGER's remarks.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, under California law, if it could be established that there was no reciprocity as far as personal property was concerned, the inheritance which that American citizen of German birth wished to leave to his mother after she was free again and the war was over would either escheat to the State or would go to collateral heirs in America, many of whom the deceased did not even know, and the burden of proof was upon the German claimant that reciprocity existed. Now, who was the claimant in all these cases? The claimant was the Office of Alien Property, claiming the interest of the German heirs under these wills or under the laws of intestacy. Now let us see what the Harry Dexter White crowd and the rest of their fellow travelers in the Office of Alien Property did in these cases. I charge they carried out plans to even defraud our courts, both State courts and Federal courts. What did they do? The records of all those cases will show that at no time did the Office of Alien Property, through their own attorneys or through the United States district attorneys, whom they often used in the trial of these cases, and whom they kept in the dark about the true state of the facts, even make one attempt to bring irrefutable evidence before the courts, which could easily have been done, through the cooperation of the State Department, by merely asking the Department of American Affairs of the Swiss Government in Germany to testify as to their findings. They knew that the Department of American Affairs of the Swiss Government would have testified in every instance that the right of American citi-

zens to inherit both real and personal property from estates in Germany existed all during the war and that these rights were being held inviolate under the treaty with the United States and that trustees were being appointed in every case and that confiscation of such American interests were not taking place and did not take place. They would have established beyond a doubt that such estates were frozen in Germany, just as similar estates were frozen in the United States by Foreign Funds Control, so that complete reciprocity existed. If they would have come forward in just one case with that kind of evidence from the Department of American Affairs of the Swiss Government—and it was always available to them—the courts would have all held that complete reciprocity existed. It was contended that the infamous Nuremberg laws against the Jews were carried over to persons of the Jewish faith in the United States who were heirs to estates in Germany. This was a lie, and they knew it; and the Swiss Government, Department of American Affairs, would have so testified. So the Office of Alien Property Custodian outdid Hitler in the persecution of people simply because they were of German ethnic origin.

About 1 month after hostilities in Germany were ended and Hitler was destroyed, on May 10, 1945, the State Department announced that the Swiss Government, Department of German Affairs, was no longer looking after German interests since the State Department said there was no longer a German Government. Simultaneously, or a short time thereafter, the State Department advised the Swiss Government that the United States no longer needed the services of their Department of American Affairs. So when this happened they blocked the road for the use of that type of evidence, and they befuddled the courts into believing that there was no German Government any more. It is true, there was no Hitler government any more, but states and nations remain even after those who have usurped the power of the government are destroyed. That has always been international law.

Immediately after Hitler's capitulation the Office of Alien Property sent its own men into Germany. They could have produced the conclusive proof themselves by going into the various courts and checking the records. They did not do it. Now when we have an agency of government dealing with the courts of the United States in that manner it becomes the duty of the Senate Judiciary Committee to go into all its operations and that is one of the reasons I have introduced Senate Resolution 72.

Whom did the Harry Dexter White crowd foist upon these United States district attorneys as expert witnesses of the German law? Everyone was a refugee from Hitler; psychologically unfit to be an impartial witness; and none of them were in Germany from 1942 to the end of hostilities, and the records will disclose that practically all of them testified that reciprocity did not exist or at least when they testified that they thought reciprocity existed, on cross ex-



amination they flopped completely. Senators should ask themselves whether that was not a deliberate attempt by the Office of Alien Property to further punish American citizens of German birth simply because they wanted to help their relatives in the old country after Hitler was destroyed.

Certainly an American GI, no matter what his race or color, had the right to make a will leaving his property to his relatives in Germany, even during the time Hitler was in power, or after he was destroyed.

The courts held down the line that no reciprocity existed. Oh, yes, the German statutes were brought in, which showed the right of an American to inherit both real and personal property from his German kin, but the propaganda was so bad and the hatred so terrible that the conclusion was that the statutes of inheritance in Germany may provide for reciprocity to inherit, but surely Hitler did not permit it. Because if Hitler did permit it, the United States Government representing these German heirs would have established the fact. All that time those men sitting in the Office of Alien Property knew that this was not true. Who played the Communist game to make these people hate us, as planned in the Kremlin? I have asked the Swiss Embassy to advise me whether they have as yet sent a bill to the United States Government charging the American taxpayer for the services they rendered to the United States through their Department of American Affairs.

I wish to place in the RECORD a newspaper clipping about one of those cases. There were hundreds of the same type of cases in California with as many in these other States. Here is the story published in the Los Angeles Daily Journal, which is the official paper for the city and county of Los Angeles, dated June 18, 1948. It is in the matter of the estate of Bertha Schluttig, who died on April 3, 1945, in the same month that Hitler and his gang were destroyed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, this particular article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN, AUSTRIAN HEIRS LOSE IN RULING OF  
JUDGE DOCKWEILER

In a case involving the rights of foreign heirs and legatees to take property in an estate in California, Judge George Dockweiler: yesterday ruled that the German and Austrian heirs were ineligible to take from the estate because the reciprocal rights of inheritance required by section 259 of the probate code did not exist under the laws of Germany and Austria on April 3, 1945, the date of the death of the decedent.

The question arose on a petition of Bertha Clements, a citizen of the United States and resident of El Paso, Tex., for a determination of heirship and interest in the estate of Bertha Schluttig, deceased.

In the residue clause of the will of the deceased all of the estate, after certain small bequests, was left to the niece and nephews of the decedent. The interests of 23 foreign legatees were vested in the Attorney General of the United States as successor to the Alien

Property Custodian. The petitioner was the sole niece residing in the United States.

At the hearing on the petition of the local legatee, who claimed the entire residue of the estate on the ground that the other legatees were ineligible under section 259, the Government of the United States was represented by Clyde C. Downing, assistant to the United States Attorney, Valentine Ham-mack of the Attorney General's office in San Francisco and Irving Jaffe of the Attorney General's office in Washington, D. C. The petitioner was represented by Henry T. Moore and Walter R. Trinkaus of Los Angeles.

The gross value of the estate is approximately \$80,000. The trial required 7 days. The decision of Judge Dockweiler, in this case is of interest because his decision as to the reciprocal rights of inheritance under German laws during the war is contrary to a recent ruling of Judge Harold B. Jeffery in the case of Estate of Peters.

William B. Stern, foreign law librarian of the Los Angeles County Law Library, testified as an expert witness for the petitioner, and Felix S. Tucker of San Francisco, formerly a judge in Germany, testified on behalf of the Government.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there were plenty of other cases just like this one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the statement which I have prepared, together with the newspaper clippings which I have attached, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There were plenty of other cases just like this one, where the deceased died in 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945, all handled by the Office of Alien Property. Now what is the result of what the Office of Alien Property did in withholding the facts from our own United States district attorneys, who they used in the trials of these cases? Now what will happen when this Congress decides, as the United States Senate decided in its last session, that these estates of American citizens, which they left to their kin in Germany, should be returned for the reason that they never constituted enemy property when they were taken? What will happen in these matters in California, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, and the other States, that had such reciprocity statutes? The money is gone, it either escheated to the State or was paid out to collateral heirs. The decisions of the courts are res adjudicata. It was only necessary for the Office of Alien Property and for the State Department to use the Department of American Affairs of the Swiss Government in one case and that would have settled all the rest of the cases. But they did not do it. Why? Because the theory of mass guilt and mass punishment and that all Germans were criminals would fall flat if they established that the courts in Germany held such inheritances of Americans inviolate against seizure.

I say they had to produce such evidence in only one case. Why do I say only in one case? Because thereafter they could have made an offer in open court in any other case that the testimony of Swiss Government Department of American Affairs to the effect that complete reciprocity existed, would be the same as in the first case. They could have asked that this evidence be stipulated and the courts would have taxed the costs to the opposing counsels in every instance, if they insisted on new proof from the Swiss Government Department of American Af-

fairs, and that proof turned out to be exactly the same, which certainly would have been the case.

Now in 1945 when the war was over and Hitler was destroyed the Office of Alien Property sent its own men into Germany and Foreign Funds Control did the same thing. They could at any time have brought back to the United States hundreds of expert witnesses on the German law and established the true facts that reciprocity existed during the entire Hitler regime, but they did not do it. Finally after some of these experts immigrated to the United States on their own behalf and came forward to testify as expert witnesses in estate matters arising in these States. The Office of Alien Property finally used some of these expert witnesses. They could not help themselves any longer, but the damage had been done.

The Office of Alien Property is vesting estates of American citizens in California, who died after the end of hostilities in April of 1945 and up to January 1, 1947, the cut-off date after which they do not vest any more estates of American citizens, who wanted to help their relatives in Germany. What happened in those cases? Well, the war-crime trials were on, and it seems that in the war trials, conducted by the military under their own rules and not under rules of American criminal law, some of these war-crimes courts, and I use the word "courts" with the greatest reluctance and with every reservation, said there was no German Government after Hitler was destroyed, so it was claimed in these estate matters that no reciprocity could exist after Hitler was destroyed. Now let's go back 1 minute to the war-crime trials and see what occurred when appeals from the decisions of the war-crimes courts were made to our United States courts. The United States courts said they had no jurisdiction, they said the war-crimes courts were military courts. I submit that no war-crimes court has the authority to decide whether a sovereign nation continues in existence or not. Only American United States civil courts have that right, and their decisions will be based on our own law and international law.

Now just a few weeks ago, on February 10 of this year, United States High Commissioner John McCloy, in Frankfurt, Germany, announced that an American court sitting in the civil matter, the United States court for restitution, had decided in a matter of restitution brought before it, in which persons of the Jewish faith were asking for restitution of their properties confiscated by Hitler, and I quote: "That the entire German Reich is responsible for restitution." The court said, and I quote from the Associated Press dispatch, February 10, 1951: "It is an erroneous interpretation that the German Nation disappeared in 1945. We must not confuse the existing form of government with the existence of the nation as such. The Kaiserreich was a form of government, which the German people had during that regime. The same thing is true of the Weimar Republic and exactly the same is true of the Third Reich." I continue to quote: "In the year 1933, Hitler and his Nazi cohorts took over the power to exercise the sovereignty of the German people in their name. The German Reich continued. The unconditional capitulation of what was left of the Nazi hierarchy in no way delivered over the sovereignty in permanence to the successful Allies. Instead the Allies threw out the persons, who can be considered as usurpers of the German sovereignty." End of quote from the decision of the United States Court on Restitution.

It was on January 29 when I first called attention of the Senate to the fact that the Attorney General was planning to sell the German Embassy building to the highest

bidder. On February 16 I stated in effect that this was the greatest piece of propaganda that could ever have been given to the Communists to weaken the will of the West German people to resist Communist aggression and that it gave proof to the Communist lie that we never want the Germans to be a nation again. Up to this time the German Embassy building has not been sold. I am informed that the Attorney General rejected all bids—thank God for that.

I say to you now that the German people consider the Embassy building not Hitler's building, but it is a symbol of the sovereignty of the German Nation, which continued after the usurpers of the sovereignty of the German people had been thrown out just as our court sitting in a civil matter said on February 10 in Frankfurt. The Office of Alien Property has not sold the Japanese Embassy building that I know of and they were our enemies. They have not sold the Bulgarian Legation now in the hands of the Communist government or the Hungarian Legation, also in the hands of the Communist government and they were our enemies. And I ask you, Why do they come forward now to sell the German Embassy building at the identical time that our military men want to give the West German people the will to join us in resisting aggression to save civilization. I say it was no accident that the proposal to sell the German Embassy building came at this identical time. I say someone planned it that way. Just like the other things were planned that I brought out today. Since the days of the Magna Carta there is no precedent in the history of civilized nations where countries that were at war sold the embassies representing the sovereignty of an enemy people, as enemy property. I should like to have one such case pointed out to me. It is contrary to the Geneva Convention under which neutral countries are requested by belligerents to look after their interests in enemy countries.

I would just like to return once more to the 13,000,000 expellees, all people of German ethnic origin driven from their homes in the eastern countries and who were left to starve in overcrowded Germany through the Hiss-White crowd and their fellow travelers without receiving any benefits, not one crust of bread from the international refugee organization, set up by Alger Hiss when he was first General Secretary of the San Francisco Conference and later on became chief adviser to the American delegation of the United Nations. Let's see what the Office of Alien Property did to these people as planned by Harry Dexter White. These 13,000,000 expellees had lived in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in the Sudetenland, and in all these other countries for generations; many of these families had lived there for 300 years, all were citizens of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, and such other countries. They, too, have had their properties confiscated on the basis that they were persons of German ethnic origin even though they were citizens of Allied countries. How did this happen? First the Harry Dexter White gang, in setting up their program to vest private properties of enemies, said that the residence of the enemy controls, that is if he lived in Germany, they would vest his property found in the United States, if he was in an Allied country they would also vest his property, if he was in a neutral country, they would block his property through Foreign Funds Control and finally seize it. After hostilities were over Foreign Funds Control, under Harry Dexter White's direction, set up with the Allied countries a program to release blocked properties and vested properties if that Allied country would issue a certificate to that individual stating that he or she was not an enemy. Now remember that the 13,000,000 people of German ethnic origin, driven from their homes in the East were forced into German territory after the

close of hostilities in 1945, so they vested their properties not because they were German citizens, but because they were in German territory. They did not only do this to the 13,000,000 expellees from Eastern Europe. They did it to others of German ethnic origin, who were in other Allied countries. Let me give you one example. I have recently had called to my attention a case arising in Holland. Here was a Dutch family that had lived in Holland for generations. They had a family, including a daughter who married a German citizen. During the war the father died in Holland. He left an estate in which he also provided for his daughter, living in Germany. Part of his estate was in assets in the banks of New York. After the war was over, the Dutch Government issued a nonenemy declaration to the daughter in Germany and returned to her the interest held in Holland, which she inherited from her father in Holland. She then used this nonenemy declaration to secure back her interests in the properties of her father's estate here in New York; and what did Foreign Funds Control and the Office of Alien Property say to her? They said, "We won't recognize the nonenemy declaration given you by our ally Holland because you married a German, and we say you are German, even though the Holland Government says you did not lose your Dutch citizenship. These things are not just accidents. They were planned that way. Somebody is still carrying out the Kremlin plan to force these people away from the west into the hands of communism."

Another case has just been called to my attention. In 1938 a German lawyer and his two unmarried sisters decided to leave Germany for good. They did not like Hitler's policies. They decided to immigrate to Holland. Before doing that they violated Hitler's foreign exchange laws by smuggling their possessions out of Germany. They opened bank accounts in Holland and in Switzerland, and they sent some of their securities to the United States for safekeeping. They did not want Hitler to use their money in a war against the United States. They entered into Holland as immigrants fully intending to become Dutch citizens, and they had only been there a short while when Hitler smashed into Holland. It was soon discovered by the Nazis that this man and his two sisters had smuggled their properties out of Germany. All three were arrested by the Gestapo. They were held in jail for a long time and finally the Nazis made a deal with them. The deal was: If you will transfer the money we found in your bank account in Switzerland back to the Reich and if you will come back to the Reich, we will drop all the charges against you and your two sisters, and we will permit your sisters to remain in Holland unmolested. If you don't agree to this you will all three be in a concentration camp. The poor man transferred his money from Switzerland, including the interest his two sisters had in this money, and he went back to Germany. He was not bothered any more by the Gestapo.

Now the war is over, it has been over for almost 6 years and this man cannot get back his share of their properties, held by the Alien Property Custodian, but his two sisters in Holland received a nonenemy declaration from the Dutch Government so their two-thirds interests in the stocks, in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian and heretofore held by the banks in New York, were returned to them. But he will not get his property back.

Since 1948 quite a number of persons of German citizenry immigrated to the United States. They came here to find freedom to build a new life. Many of them had properties in the United States during the war and most of them wanted to come to our shores long before the war broke out. With the coming of the war their properties here

in the United States were confiscated by the Alien Property Custodian, and even though they are now legally admitted to the United States and have lived here for a number of years and some have already become citizens, the Office of Alien Property will not return their vested properties. I ask you, is it time we make a complete investigation of the operations of that office. There cannot be any other answer, but that we must do it and do it quickly.

For five long years the Office of Alien Property contended that it could not return properties to such people. Why? Because of the Harry Dexter White policies, which classed them all as enemies regardless of what allied countries they were citizens and regardless of how anti-Hitler they were. The Office of Alien Property carried out a racist doctrine, the same as Hitler did, and I say this doctrine was the doctrine of the Kremlin to drive these people away from the West into the hands of godless international communism. At this point I would like to read from an editorial that appeared in the issue of the Saturday Evening Post of February 24, just a little over 4 weeks ago:

**"OUR ENEMIES ARE THE RED TYRANTS, NOT THEIR SLAVES"**

"In 1933, when Hitler rose to power in Germany, the English translation of Mein Kampf, his political manifesto, attracted general attention. But the book made such wild statements and the intentions he expressed then seemed so fantastic that people, understandably, dismissed them as the ravings of a lunatic.

"The events that followed might have served as a warning. Did they? Not at all. During the war we busily constructed another myth: good, kindly old Uncle Joe Stalin. His basic opinions and philosophy of government were and are available in a dozen relevant volumes circulated by the Comintern. The Western allies—with some notable exceptions, who were cut adrift as hopeless reactionaries—preferred to think that Joe didn't really mean what he had written and believed for more than 50 years.

"Also, during the war, Mao Tse-tung, leader of Communist China, published a much smaller and more sober book than Hitler's, but equally plain-spoken. It concerned the nature of the "democracy" his party proposed to set up. At the time, we were still supporting Chiang Kai-shek, with some reservations. The present Red dictator, then confined to the province of Yenan, made it perfectly clear that he was an authentic Communist, that he was a Moscow man, and that he had nothing but contempt for Western capitalistic nations.

"Once more we brushed aside a man's honest account of himself and insisted on setting up an imaginary figure, heading a party said to be composed almost entirely of Chinese facsimiles of Midwestern county farm agents, school superintendents and horse-and-buggy doctors. The folly of attempting to change a hostile totalitarian into a friend by treating him as if he were something he was not—and which he insisted he was not—ought to have been apparent to any informed observer. The example of Hitler should have been fresh in our minds.

"Mao's book was no secret document. Six years ago Communist bookshops all over the country were selling it in cheap 25-cent reprints. Anybody could walk in and buy one. Yet wishful thinking, if nothing worse, kept its obvious conclusions out of our policy-making.

"We seem now on the verge of repeating another mistake. However useful the policy of unconditional surrender may have been from a military point of view—and that is debatable—there is no question about its hampering effect in psychological warfare and in the making of a peace that might have been durable. In effect, it assumed that all Germans were indistinguishable from



Nazis. We could not treat with or give encouragement to any of the elements within Germany who might have hastened the fall of Hitler. It is now clear that they represented a considerable force, including such figures as Rommel. We preferred to stick to what was really a racist doctrine—that all Germans were ineradicably vicious and would remain so until reeducated.

"At present, many commentators, in and out of Government, appear to be well on the way toward a similar confusion between the Soviet bureaucracy and the Russian people. It has been revealed, time and again, that the tightly controlled, frequently purged governing class represents no more than 3 percent of the population of the U. S. S. R. This again is no secret. They boast it, and like to refer to themselves as the shining spear point of a revolution which the masses are still too backward—after 33 years—to understand.

"To charge the Russian people, as a recent book does, with 'duplicity, evasiveness, procrastination, crudeness, callousness, ruthlessness, brutality' is to transfer to all Russians the traits evident in a Molotov, a Malik or a Stalin. Such a charge also contradicts our well-founded contention that the Communist Party is and always was an instrument of oppression, a minority dictatorship.

"There are still, in and out of the Soviet Union, millions of Russians who remember very well that the liberal revolution they made under Kerensky in the spring of 1917 was stolen from them the following winter by Lenin's Bolsheviks. When the only free democratic elections ever held under their auspices resulted in a 2-to-1 majority against them in the Constituent Assembly, the Communists broke up the convention with bayonets on the first and only day it ever met.

"With the example before us of lost opportunities created in Germany, during and after the war, by a policy which refused to distinguish between oppressor and oppressed within an enemy nation, we should take the greatest care not to repeat the error with Russia. Rekindling the hope of true freedom in the ordinary Russian is a weapon worth a hundred atomic bombs. It may be our best hope of survival for ourselves."

May I just repeat what the editorial said: "We prefer to stick to what was really a racist doctrine." I say that we did not do it. That was the doctrine of the Kremlin. I repeat from the editorial just this one more sentence: "With the examples before us of lost opportunities created in Germany during and after the war by a policy, which refused to distinguish between oppressor and oppressed within an enemy nation. We should take the greatest care not to repeat the error with Russia." That is exactly what I said in my speech before this body on January 29 and again on February 5, but I go further than that. I say that we still have not only the opportunity but the duty to correct these wrongs as far as the German people are concerned, and we have little time to lose. It is better for us to admit frankly that we were the victims of a world-wide Communist conspiracy aimed as much against us as against the German people than to give credence to the Communist lie, through continued silence that these terrible things were actually American policy, which everyone in this Senate knows was not the case.

I am sure the Members of this Senate will be surprised at all of these disclosures, but I tell you now there is much more to come out, and that is why I ask for early consideration of Senate Resolution 72. We must get all the facts. All of you, who were on the floor on February 5, will recall that I proved beyond a doubt that the Harry Dexter White and the Alger Hiss crowd blackjacked every neutral country to strip every German civilian of their assets in those neutral countries, assets which they

smuggled out of Germany in order to keep Hitler from using them in a war against us. All this blackjacking was done on the theory that we did not want the Nazis to gain from their loot. Now let's take a look and see what these countries have done since 1949 or more particularly 1950 regarding these matters, which were forced down their throats under threat of reprisals from the Harry Dexter White crew and the Alger Hiss crew. Most of them stopped liquidating German private property as soon as the Un-American Activities Committee started uncovering the facts about Communists in high positions in our own Government, and as soon as Alger Hiss was convicted they all took courage. Now let's see what they have done since Hiss' conviction in January 1950. It seems they all got a lot of courage. Remember, Harry Dexter White was dead. Lawrence Duggan was dead. Harry Dexter White, it was said, died from a dose of digitals. Duggan's body was found on the ground after a 16-story jump or push from his office window in New York. Let's see what these countries now did after the Un-American Activities Committee and the courts got through with these traitors and fellow travelers. Let's see what they did with reference to the private property of German citizens in their countries. Most of the countries refused to liquidate German private properties and did not liquidate them. The Swiss controlled the properties as they were forced to do by Harry Dexter White's crew, but they made the liquidation of such properties subject to an agreement of indemnity by the United States. Many of the smaller nations have already decided to return such private property to the rightful owners. Columbia, Uruguay, Nicaragua, and San Salvador have already decided to return these private properties. The country of Uruguay gave an excellent example of justice that we might all consider. On the 1st day of April 1950, 3 months after the Hiss conviction, a decree was issued by the Secretary for Interior Affairs of Uruguay to return all of the remaining properties, which they had vested, to their private German owners, and the decree stated that when they originally vested these German private properties it was the intention of the Government of Uruguay to return these private properties to the German people as soon as commercial relations between the two countries were reestablished; and these properties have now all been returned.

In February of 1950, just about a month after the conviction of Hiss was confirmed, the Nicaraguan Government released all private property of Germans. Brazil has not gone quite so far as yet, but they have returned the property of German citizens now living in Brazil and the Brazilian Government has announced that the return of the liquidated German properties will be considered in the peace treaty with the new German Government. Now what has Mexico done? Coffee plantations owned by Germans have been returned. Now remember, all of these things happened after Hiss was convicted. They all got courage to do what was right and just because they no longer feared the Hiss-White crowd and they knew that the Congress of the United States was going to reverse and throw out all these un-American policies based on mass guilt and mass punishment. On November 10, 1950, president Peron of Argentina issued a presidential order establishing a special commission, which should report in 3-months time with reference to the disposition of German private property in Argentina and particularly with those industries and businesses, which had heretofore been made a part of the state-controlled industry group, called *Dirie*. They will be reporting soon. Just this week the Egyptian Government announced that it had decided to return all private property of German citizens located

in Egypt, which the Egyptian Government took over during the war. I have not had time to check the matter of how other countries are approaching these problems, and I don't believe that there is a Senator on the floor, who knew that the above-named countries had taken the steps that they did. One would think that our State Department would advise Congress on such matters. Certainly, the Office of Alien Property knows what's going on in all these other countries in relation to enemy property and we have not heard one word from them.

Now let's see what has happened in Switzerland. John Carter Vincent, 1 of the 81 State Department employees whom our colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH McCARTHY asked this Senate to investigate because he belonged to the Alger Hiss crowd, who sold Korea down the river, was United States Minister to Switzerland just up until about 1 month ago. This is the same John Carter Vincent, who was the State Department Director of Far Eastern Affairs at the time the State Department was pursuing a policy requiring Chiang Kai-shek to collaborate with the Communists. He was among the most vocal of those, who regarded the Chinese Reds as agrarian reformers. He was one of the State Department officials, who publicly praised the Division of Korea after World War II as "an auspicious test for Soviet-American cooperation in the Far East."

John Carter Vincent was Minister to Switzerland up until about 1 month ago. Suddenly he was moved to a lesser position as Chief of the United States Mission to Tangier, and within the last 3 weeks the Swiss Government determined to do justice with reference to the private properties of German citizens in that country. Remember in 1946 under the direction of Foreign Funds Control under Harry Dexter White's personal control and with the cooperation of Alger Hiss in the State Department our Government, acting for the 17 allied countries, forced the Swiss Government to enter into an agreement to liquidate all private property located in Switzerland, which was owned by German citizens. The agreement was signed, but the Swiss refused to go ahead with it except on a basis of an identification, which the State Department and Alger Hiss could not give them. Now 3 weeks ago, new discussions with reference to these properties, were begun by the Swiss Government with the Allied Powers, and only this week it was announced from Bern, Switzerland, that the private property of 16,000 German citizens, which they had in Switzerland, would be returned in full by the Swiss and that the Swiss Government would be freed from the restrictions forced upon them in 1946 by Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White through the infamous liquidation and confiscation agreement. In addition to this the Swiss Government stated that every German citizen who owned real estate in Switzerland would be paid for that real estate up to 10,000 Swiss francs, the equivalent of \$2,300, the balance to be paid later. The rate of exchange would be 100 Swiss francs for 95.88 West German marks. The Swiss Government insisted that the loss of these moneys to the people of little means in Germany "would have been inhuman." There were approximately 20,000 accounts of German citizens in Switzerland and mostly the accounts of little people, who tried to get their moneys out of Germany so that Hitler could not use it in a war against us, just as I had said in my previous speech. It is high time that the United States of America, which should provide moral leadership for the world straighten out the mess in our Office of Alien Property and Foreign Funds Control, and to once and for all wipe out this stain of injustice smeared on the good name of the United States by traitors and fellow travelers.

I do not know whether you are familiar with the fact that on February 16, the same day that the Attorney General of the United States planned to sell the German Embassy Building in Washington as enemy property that in Bonn, Germany, the capital of democratic Western Germany the West German Cabinet met and decided unanimously to acknowledge responsibility for the pre-war debts of the Reich, and it is estimated that at current rate of exchange this will amount to better than \$5,600,000,000 and of course the principal creditor is the United States of America.

What I have said above with reference to the action of the German Cabinet was carried by the Associated Press and other press services 2 weeks ago.

While I was in Germany I heard that it was the intention of the German people and of their West German government to make good the wrongs perpetrated by the Nazis on American soldiers and civilians in violation of the rules of war. I remember that one newspaper in Germany, I believe it was in Mannheim, wrote that the damages provided under the War Claims Act, passed by this Congress, are truly obligations of all the German people. Yes; it was the *Mannheimer Morgen* issue of Friday, January 5, 1951:

#### "DEUTSCHE SOLLEN WIEDER ERBEN

"DIE FREIGABE DEUTSCHEN EIGENTUMS IN DEN USA/LOCKERUNG FÜR VERFOLGTE UND FÜR ERBSCHAFTEN?

"Die komplizierte Frage des im Ausland beschlagnahmten deutschen Eigentums ist nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg noch viel schwerer zu lösen als vor dreissig Jahren. Einer gütlichen und für Deutschland einigermassen günstigen Regelung stehen sehr viel grössere Hindernisse entgegen als etwas nach dem Versailler Vertrag. Damals schlossen wenigstens die Vereinigten Staaten mit Deutschland das Abkommen vom 10. August 1922, als dessen Folge später 80 Prozent des seit 1917 beschlagnahmten deutschen Privateigentums zurückerstattet wurden. Im Gegensatz dazu hat sich diesmal der Kontrollrat nach dem Potsdamer Abkommen bemüht, auch diejenigen deutschen Auslandsvermögen zu erfassen, die noch nicht von den kriegführenden Mächten beschlagnahmt worden waren. Gerade unter dem Druck der USA musste dabei die Schweiz im Jahre 1946 jenes Washingtoner Abkommen über die Liquidierung des deutschen Vermögens in ihrem Hoheitsgebiet abschliessen, das von einschichtigen Kritikern als Verletzung der schweizerischen Souveränität, ihrer Neutralität und ihrer rechtsstaatlichen Tradition gekennzeichnet wurde. Auch Schweden und Portugal hatten ähnliche Abkommen mit den Besatzungsmächten zu schliessen.

"Dennoch blieben in den USA jene Kräfte, die eine Beschlagnahme des Feindvermögens ablehnten, weil das Privateigentum auch im Kriege unangetastet bleiben müsse. Bereits im Jahre 1943 wandten sie sich gegen eine solche verfassungswidrige Massnahme und erkannten lediglich für die Dauer des Krieges eine staatliche Erfassung und Kontrolle von feindlichem Eigentum an. Aus einem ähnlichen Geist heraus hatte in den Jahren von 1923 bis 1930 die zweiköpfige "gemischte Kommission", bestehend aus dem Amerikaner Chandler P. Anderson und dem Hamburger Wilhelm Kieselbach, dem nachmaligen hochangesehenen Präsidenten den Zentraljustizrat für die britische Zone, eine einmalige und vorbildliche Leistung vollbracht. Zwar sollte nach dem Abkommen von 1922 das beschlagnahmte deutsche Eigentum zunächst dazu dienen, solche privaten Schadenersatzansprüche von Amerikanern zu befriedigen, die durch den Krieg entstanden waren. Die beiden Männer haben aber daraufhin gemeinsam jeden einzelnen Anspruch untersucht und entschieden. Hinsichtlich der Schäden, die der in den USA besonders verhasste uneinge-

schränkte U-Boot-Krieg verursacht hatte, wurde ein Vergleich geschlossen. Ueber das nach allen Seiten vorteilhafte materielle Ergebnis hinaus hat diese Arbeit einen grossen moralischen Gewinn für die beteiligten Länder bedeutet. Ein Restvermögen im Wert von mehreren Millionen Dollar, das aus beschlagnahmten deutschen Werten des ersten Weltkrieges stammt, wird allerdings heute noch vom Verwalter für Feindvermögen zurückgehalten.

"Heute ist in den USA alles Vermögen beschlagnahmt, das deutschen Staatsbürgern vor dem 1. Januar 1947 gehört hat oder von ihnen bis zu diesem Zeitpunkt erworben wurde. Ausnahmen gelten nur für Verfolgte, wobei jedoch sehr strenge Massstäbe angelegt werden. Widerstand gegen die Rückgabe dieser ungeheuren Werte wird vor allem von den verschiedenen Interessenten geleistet. Hinzukommen allerlei stimmungsmässige Gründe und die noch im Juli 1948 erlassene gesetzliche Vorschrift, dass auch nach diesem Kriege das frühere Feindvermögen dazu herhalten müsse, um die Schadenersatzansprüche amerikanischer Bürger zu befriedigen. Dazu gehören diesmal z. B. auch die Forderungen von amerikanischen Soldaten, die während der Kriegsgefangenschaft in Deutschland völkerrechtswidrig behandelt wurden. Private Vermögenswerte sollen also für Schäden haften, für die eigentlich der deutsche Staat einzutreten hätte.

"Eine gewisse Auflockerung zugunsten deutscher Eigentümer ist vorerst höchstens durch eine Erweiterung der Ausnahmen für die Verfolgten zu erwarten, sowie in dem Sonderfall der deutschen Erben. In etwa 10,000 Fällen haben nämlich amerikanische Bürger, die vor dem 1. Januar 1947 verstorben sind, Testamente zugunsten von deutschen Erben hinterlassen. Der Wert dieser Erbschaften beträgt etwa 70 Millionen Dollar. Sie sind gleichfalls beschlagnahmt worden, weil die Erben Deutsche waren, obwohl streng genommen diese Werte immer amerikanischen und niemals deutsches Vermögen gewesen sind. Heute wird die Freigabe dieser Erbschaften verlangt mit der Begründung, dass damit die amerikanischen Bürger ihren in Not geratenen deutschen Verwandten helfen wollen, und dass sie nun stattdessen durch die Beschlagnahme diskriminiert würden.

"Ohne eine Aenderung der bestehenden Gesetze wird allerdings nicht einmal die Freigabe dieser Erbschaften möglich sein. Der letzte Kongress hat zwar im Sommer schon einmal eine derartige Vorlage einstimmig angenommen, im Repräsentantenhaus scheiterte der gleiche Versuch aber. Da inzwischen Neuwahlen stattgefunden haben, muss der 82. Kongress, der am 3. Januar zum ersten Male zusammengetreten ist, erneut beraten und abstimmen. Angestrichelt der verschiedenartigen Einflüsse, die in den USA auf die Parlamentarier ausgeübt werden, ist das ein Nachteil. Zudem überschatten die weltpolitischen Fragen diese bis jetzt mehr innenpolitische Auseinandersetzung in den USA. Die veränderte politische Lage Deutschlands gegenüber dem Zustand von 1945 und die Ueberwindung des Morgenthau-Denkens in der Besatzungspolitik müssten aber eigentlich mit der Zeit auch ihre Rückwirkungen auf die Haltung des amerikanischen Mutterlandes und seiner Abgeordneten haben, ebenso wie auch Italien bereits im Jahre 1947 aus der Sondergesetzgebung gegen die früheren Gegner der USA herausgenommen worden ist.

"U. H."

I should like to read the entire article in German, and I can assure my colleagues that it is written in the language of Schiller and Goethe and not in the language of Hitler, who was not even a German. It is written in the spirit of Schiller and Goethe, whose masterful writings referred constantly to the dignity of man and condemned man's en-

slavement through dictatorship by whatever name. Some of my distinguished colleagues will probably not understand it, so therefore, I believe it best to ask unanimous consent that this article be made a part of the Record, and for the benefit of my colleagues, who cannot understand nor read German I am going to ask the Library of Congress to make a translation of the same, for I am sure you all want to read this article. I cannot permit this opportunity to pass without paying tribute to the newspapermen in Western Germany who under almost intolerable conditions, brought about by Red fellow travelers in our own Government, are still carrying on courageously to give the West German people the will to resist Communist aggression, but I say to you, the Congress of the United States must now stand behind those newspapers and the new West German Republic.

Returning just once more to the announcement of the West German Cabinet acknowledging responsibility for debts of \$5,600,000,000 I want to say that I do not know whether the Cabinet of the democratic Western Germany included these war claims, but I believe that they did, and I intend to make inquiry of the State Department to find out whether this is true. If this is the case then it is time for the Senate of the United States not only to immediately pass the legislation to return the gifts, and bequests that their American relatives left them, but it is time to go into the entire matter of private enemy property seized by the Office of Alien Property. Think of it, the West German Government acknowledges this debt and wants to pay it; they want to pay it entirely. A good part of this debt was created by Hitler, they even want to pay the debt of the now extinct Prussian state government, and I am quite confident that they included the war claims referred to above. The reason I say this is because the young men in Western Germany will be comrades in arms against the threat of further Communist aggression and surely those German soldiers will want their Government to make good as far as is humanly possible the terrible things that happened to our American soldiers at the hands of the Nazis, for which we tried to provide under the War Claims Act, but did so in the way Harry Dexter White and the Office of Alien Property wanted us to do, namely by confiscating all these properties.

I am receiving many letters, and I have heard from other Senators that they are all receiving letters not only from American citizens of German birth, but from American citizens of Czech, Polish, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Estonian, Lithuanian, Latvian birth asking us to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, that the little property, the bequests that they might want to leave their relatives behind the iron curtain after they are free will not be taken away from them in event the war spreads; and I receive many letters from good American citizens of German birth, who have mothers and fathers behind the iron curtain in Russian-controlled Germany, who ask the same thing.

I submit that the right of an American to dispose of his property by will or by the laws of intestacy or by a trust created for the benefit of his relatives even though they live in enemy country, where that property remains in the United States during any war, must be held inviolate unless we are to brand any such citizen as a traitor simply because he wanted to carry out his moral obligation after the war was over to the unfortunate members of his family, who were enslaved.

I submit we have gone halfway to communism by stripping American citizens of their right to dispose of their property when we know that such disposition cannot aid the enemy and is only made out of humanitarian reasons of kinship. We must cor-



rect the wrong that has been done, and we must protect all of our other foreign-born citizens from the same wrong in any future conflict. It is for that reason that I have introduced S. 873 to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act now being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee which, when passed, will return such properties heretofore vested and will prohibit the confiscation of such properties of Americans in any present or future conflict, and thus will protect the property of our citizens of Polish, Czech, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Estonian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and German birth from such un-American confiscation.

This also affects our citizens of German birth in event the war spreads to Europe. Many of them have relatives living in the Russian-occupied zone of Germany. Surely if there is a war, they will be enemies. They don't want their American properties, that they might wish to leave to their relatives now enslaved in Eastern Germany, confiscated by the United States as has been done in World War II, neither do they want these properties to fall into the hands of the Communist government. They want their properties, which they might wish to leave to their relatives in Eastern Germany held in trust until their relatives are free from Communist enslavement.

Now, I just want to say a few words about the insidious propaganda carried on by the Kremlin and the Kremlin agents, which prepare the ground work for the alien doctrine of mass guilt and mass punishment. During World War II the propaganda agency, known as the Office of War Information, was the one agency of Government that through the press, and through the radio, through lectures and speakers spread hate throughout the country and laid the ground work for the Kremlin policy of a hard peace. They laid the ground work for unconditional surrender, and that agency had plenty of Communists in high positions. They laid the ground work for Yalta, with Alger Hiss as American adviser. It was at Yalta where not only the decisions were made, which turned Manchuria over to the Communists and made it possible for the Chinese Reds to take over all of China and to now fight our American soldiers in Korea, where we have already suffered approximately 60,000 casualties, but where also the sell-out of Europe was engineered, by the Communist advisers to our sick and ailing President; that's where it was agreed to implement these decisions by the Potsdam agreement. Remember, all these things happened before we recognized we had traitors in high positions in our Government. They were actually making the policies.

When the history of this period is written I am convinced that it will be positively established that the Office of War Information was the funnel through which the Kremlin spread the propaganda of hate and revenge, and it will be established without a doubt that the decisions of Yalta and Potsdam had never entered the minds of the leaders of our Government until the Office of War Information, through its instruments of propaganda, carried out by Communists and fellow travelers, had prepared the way for such decisions, and in this diabolical plan they used the great free press of America and every radio station and every publisher of every book and magazine unknowingly and unwittingly to carry out the Kremlin plan for final world aggression. Now I tell you that the Communist plan is to again have us make the same mistakes we made during World War II and immediately thereafter. During the war we heard the propaganda of Pan-Germanism. Now we hear the propaganda of Pan-Slavism. Books and pamphlets are already being published. Just as the Saturday Evening Post article said, which I have heretofore put in the Record. This pamphlet charges the entire Russian people

with duplicity, evasiveness, procrastination, crudeness, callousness, ruthlessness, brutality. This is a falsehood, and everyone knows it. Those adjectives can only apply to their enslavers in the Kremlin and not to the entire Russian people or to the Slavic people under their control, or to the people in East Germany under their control.

During the war and immediately thereafter we heard the propaganda that there was religious freedom in Soviet Russia and that anti-Semitism was prohibited by law. A lot of our people are still fooled by that, but I tell you now that the masters in the Kremlin are both anti-Christian and anti-Semitic. As far as the first part is concerned we all know of the terrible things that have happened to the ministers of all Christian denominations behind the iron curtain at the hands of the Communists; and right here in our own United States we have Jewish organizations, whose entire work exists of rescuing endangered Jews from Russia and the Russian satellite countries. I would like to put into the Record a United Press story, which appeared in the press throughout the country 2 weeks ago over the heading "Jewish underground saves 1,000 from Reds." It reads as follows:

**"JEWISH UNDERGROUND SAVES 1,000 FROM REDS"**

**"ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—**The Jewish Labor Committee said Saturday that its revived underground has rescued 1,000 'endangered' Jews from Russian satellite countries and taken them to Israel.

**"**Their escape was made under the noses of Soviet-dominated secret police.' Executive Secretary Jacob Pat told a conference of the committee, which represents 500,000 members."

Why did these people of the Jewish faith have to escape from the Soviet secret police? Simply because they did not become anti-God Communists. They did not become apostates to the faith of their fathers and their own faith; and just last week there was another story from Vienna, Austria, that some of these Jewish people are being pushed over the borders from Hungary into Austria, but before they are pushed over every piece of food that they have with them is taken away from them. As a result of the false propaganda that there is no anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia, unthinking people conclude falsely that Jewish people are Communists and that international communism is run by Jews. Let's face the facts, the international Kremlin controlled Communist, whether he has a Christian name or whether he has a Jewish name, is an apostate from the faith of his fathers, be that the Christian faith, the Jewish faith, or any other faith, that teaches the fatherhood of God of all men and insists on the practice of the brotherhood of men. Can there be any doubt about this? On March 3, 1951, the press services carried the story from Stockholm under the heading Russians list religion as a foreign word. I would like to put into the Record this dispatch that appeared in the Chicago Tribune from Stockholm, which reads as follows:

**"RUSSIANS LIST RELIGION AS A FOREIGN WORD"**

**"STOCKHOLM, March 3.—**The Soviet State Printing & Publishing Co. has recently issued in Moscow a list of 'words foreign to the Russian language.' Two definitions from the list reproduced here are:

**"**Religion: A fanciful, unscientific belief in gods, angels, souls, etc. Christianity started when the slave system of antiquity broke down. Religion was supported and encouraged by the interests of reactionaries."

**"**Bible: A collection of imaginary legends without any scientific basis. Full of dark insinuations, historical mistakes, and falsehoods. Used as an instrument of power by the church to hold down ignorant people."

Every Communist rejects God and therefore denies that man has any unalienable rights given man by his Creator, and the plan is to make their godless state supreme in the world denying to all men their unalienable rights regardless of their race, their creed, or their color. We must reverse every one of our policies, which were based on hate and revenge, and we must see to it now that we do not hate people behind the iron curtain. We must completely distinguish between governments over which the people have nothing to say and the good people themselves, who are enslaved by such governments.

Let me once more repeat the Kremlin master plan for aggression. It requires in all instances the skillful execution of carefully prepared campaigns, often subtle and often indirect; many times using causes, which in themselves are good, for evil ends, carried out over long periods of time without apparent connection; plans which have as their sole purpose the weakening of the will of the free people to resist Communist aggression when the time is ripe. Let me repeat the latter part of that statement so that we will remember it. The Kremlin master plan for aggression is to do everything to weaken the will of the free people to resist Communist aggression when the time is ripe.

From all indications in Western Europe we may soon be faced with a second Korea in Germany, divided as it is, just like Korea was divided, with strong military forces in Eastern Germany and with no military forces in Western Germany, except a few of our own boys. An exact parallel of the situation in Northern Korea, where the North Korean Communists were armed to the teeth and where the South Korean defenses were sabotaged by our State Department. We must do everything in our power immediately to see to it that there is not another Korea in Western Europe and to do that we must immediately make a just and honest peace with the democratic West German Government. We cannot expect the citizens in Western Germany to willingly set up defense forces against further Communist aggression without such a treaty for the reason that every German who would join such a western defense force without the protection of a treaty of peace would be considered a partisan by the Communist aggressors and since the Kremlin is not a party to the Geneva Convention everyone of those West German soldiers would be subject to summary execution when captured by the Communists. Is it any wonder that under those circumstances they are reluctant to join the western defense alliance? I urge the Members of the Senate and especially the members of the Foreign Relations Committee to immediately insist that the executive branch of our Government and our State Department take steps to bring about a peace treaty with Germany and that this matter be not delayed until there is a peace treaty with Japan. The danger point now is Western Europe and first things must come first. In the meantime while that is being done we must remove from our statute books all repressive laws. It is therefore that I urge the adoption of Resolution 72 to investigate completely the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act and that we amend the Trading With the Enemy Act as provided in S. 873 to return American properties left to former enemies by American citizens in their American estates and trusts and otherwise and to prevent the confiscation of similar properties of American citizens in any future conflict.

The formation of American policy has heretofore been in the hands of the State Department. We cannot leave it there any longer. The time has now arrived when the Congress of the United States must set the foreign policy for the United States, speaking in the name of all the American people.

My resolution should be promptly considered and the asked-for relief granted by this Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, all that I am pleading for is that my resolution may be considered by the Judiciary Committee, and considered soon. It certainly is not fair that some of the relatives of GI's, who are desperately in need of money, are unable to get hold of the property which the GI's and some American citizens of German birth left to them upon their death.

#### REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER's speech,

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the reason I am asking the Senator to yield at this time is that it is necessary for me to leave the floor in a few minutes. Before I leave, I should like to say that I hope the fact that we are not discussing today on the floor of the Senate, at least at this time, the great victory which the Communists sustained last night does not mean that we are not aware that they have won such a victory. The reason I am not discussing it is that I am going to the town which was the former home of the greatest American I know, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I intend to discuss there the great Communist victory of last night. I intend to discuss the fact that the midnight potency of bourbon and benedictine may well have condemned thousands of American boys to death, and may well have condemned western civilization.

I intend to discuss the fact that the only crime of Douglas MacArthur was that he has always been against communism and would not go along with the Yalta crowd for the sell-out in Asia. I intend to discuss the fact that his principal crime in the eyes of the Acheson-Hiss crowd in the State Department is that he felt and still feels that it was right and proper that others than American boys should have the opportunity to die in the fight against international communism. I intend to discuss these subjects in Milwaukee, Wis., the former home of Douglas MacArthur. That is why I am not discussing it on the floor of the Senate today.

I would say further, Mr. President, that Democrats have a glorious opportunity today, if they will but rise to the occasion. Unless the Democrats in the Senate and House—after all, they are in control—stand up and let themselves be counted as being against treason they will forever, and rightly, have labeled their party as the party of betrayal. Again I say the reason I am not discussing the subject today on the floor of the Senate is because I intend to discuss it in detail tonight.

Mr. LANGER. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] will have a very fine trip. I know he will have a large audience to address, because wherever the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin talks, he always talks to a large audience; thousands of people cannot get into the hall to listen to him. I am sure that tonight when he speaks

in Milwaukee, the former home of Douglas MacArthur, he will have the usual great audience.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is ordered.

#### NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably sundry routine nominations in the armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BYRD. I now ask unanimous consent that these routine nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations in the armed services? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, en bloc. Without objection, the President will be notified.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hendrickson	Neely
Bricker	Hennings	Nixon
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Butler, Md.	Hill	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Robertson
Capehart	Ives	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kem	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kerr	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kilgore	Stennis
Douglas	Knowland	Taft
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Tobey
Eastland	Lodge	Underwood
Eaton	McCarran	Watkins
Ellender	McCarthy	Welker
Ferguson	McFarland	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Young
George	Millikin	
Gillette	Monroney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

#### REPLACEMENT OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I share the deep regret which I know the President felt when he was compelled to relieve General MacArthur of his command. The general, however, left him no choice. The choice was not between MacArthur

and Dean Acheson; it was between MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was not between MacArthur and the State Department; it was between the general and the Defense Department.

It was not a choice between fighting in Korea or pulling out of Korea; it was a choice between doing the job we have in Korea and getting it over with or permitting MacArthur to get us into an all-out war with Red China.

It was a choice of this Nation going alone with MacArthur into the mire and jungle of Red China or waging a joint action against aggression with the aid and support of 51 friendly free nations.

The job in the Far East is too important to the lives of our fighting men and the security of our Nation to be handled by any man who is either unwilling or unable to cooperate with his superiors.

As Commander in Chief, the President is responsible to 150,000,000 Americans. They know that in order to insure victory our military leaders must work together as a team. When General MacArthur refused to do this, the President had to put somebody else in who would.

Mr. President, certain facts stand out bold and clear before the American people and before the Government of the United States:

First. We are in the midst of the most critical period in our history.

Second. Our purpose is peace.

Third. Our primary and principal enemy is Soviet Russia.

Fourth. We must keep all the friends and allies we now have and make every effort to secure new ones.

Fifth. We must continue to mobilize our manpower, physical resources, and productive capacity.

Sixth. We must continue to work through the United Nations to stop aggression, prevent its spread if we are able to, and keep it as far removed from our own shores as is humanly possible.

In all these things we must work at home and with our allies for that abiding peace which is the ultimate goal of all our aims and all our efforts.

Mr. President, I do not believe that another world war is inevitable. I am opposed to any political, diplomatic, or military policy on the part of my Government which assumes fatalistically that an all-out war with either Soviet Russia or Red China is inevitable; and I am opposed to any act on the part of any responsible Government official calculated to encourage or permit such an all-out struggle.

We are not in Korea today to start a world war, or to start or engage in an all-out war with Red China. We and many other countries who are our allies are in Korea for a very definite and specific purpose. We are there to stop aggression, to punish the aggressor, and to prevent the spread of the conflict into a world war.

These are clear and positive objectives. We and our allies are holding our positions in Korea. We are growing stronger by the hour. We are inflicting terrible and increasing losses on the aggressors.

And, Mr. President, the aggressors in Korea are failing. North Korea is failing and Red China is failing. The war



lords of Red China have repeatedly announced to their own people and to the world that their purpose is to drive the military forces of the United Nations out of all of Korea. They have promised to establish the Communist leaders of North Korea as the rulers and masters of all of the Korean people.

Red China suffers a major defeat each day she fails in her efforts to drive us out of Korea. She is losing as she continues to send tens of thousands of her best manpower to be destroyed by superior fire power of the United Nations armed forces. Her people know that she needs these tens of thousands at home to produce meat and bread for her hungry millions.

I am convinced that Red China cannot send enough of her inadequately armed military manpower into Korea to drive the United Nations out. I believe this fact is apparent, not only to the disillusioned Red leaders of that unhappy nation, but I think the inevitable day is nearer when an aroused Chinese people will know it and call their own leaders to task for this reckless, brutal, and tragic folly.

However, Mr. President, we must not lose sight of our basic aim. We are fighting for peace. Our best hope to achieve it is to hold the aggressor at bay and punish him until he is willing to accept responsible terms of an honorable peace.

We do not have to go into China to achieve this purpose. We are achieving it in Korea. If circumstances beyond our control were to force us into a general war with China, it would be a great misfortune. If we permit anybody to push us into such a general war, it would be a terrible tragedy. It would be to invite a hopeless, useless struggle.

Mr. President, I repeat what I have said before—that much of what General MacArthur was doing and saying would have gotten us deeper into war instead of successfully ending the one in which we are already engaged.

Mr. President, we are fighting in Korea as one of the United Nations under a mandate of 52 countries for the achievement of a common purpose. If we had permitted General MacArthur to carry the war to the mainland of China, we would have to go alone, without our allies, and into a struggle that would be our sole responsibility. England, France, Canada, and Australia have already said they will not be a party to such an undertaking; neither will the others.

Mr. President, as we realize what MacArthur was trying to do, we are appalled. I cannot imagine any situation more tragic for our country. I cannot imagine anything that would better serve the objectives of our primary enemy, Soviet Russia. To have permitted it would have been nothing short of madness.

Mr. President, we are building military forces and military power to prevent war with Soviet Russia and to achieve a responsible peace. Deliberately to commit that military power to a land war with China would be to lose it in one war and render ourselves incapable either of preventing or winning a war with Russia if it should be forced upon us.

Winston Churchill voiced the opinion of many of the ablest leaders of the free world when he said that "Russia has been prevented from starting world war three because of her fear of American air power and the American stockpile of atomic bombs."

An all-out war with Red China, Mr. President, would force the diversion of much of that air power and the use of who knows how great a percentage of that stockpile of atomic bombs.

Ah, but Members of the Senate say that we could use Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Army now on Formosa. Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Army could not whip the Red forces at the beginning of their civil strife. Our Government gave him in grants and loans billions of dollars in money, material, and military supplies, and still he could not stay on the mainland. And I give you this cold fact, Mr. President, that much of Red China's munitions of war used against us in Korea was the equipment and supplies abandoned by Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Army when it was being driven off the mainland.

Mr. President, I do not believe that Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Army could stay on Formosa without the protection of the American fleet, much less invade the mainland of China. The only conceivable way for Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Army to invade the mainland would be under the protection of the United States Navy on the sea, the United States Air Force in the air, and led by the United States Army on the ground—to open a way for him.

Ah, Mr. President, that might serve the purpose of Chiang Kai-shek—and I have nothing either for or against him in this argument—but where is the American father or mother or wife or son or daughter who wants the men in our Armed Forces carrying out such a military mission?

Mr. President, Oklahoma's own Forty-fifth Division soon will be in the occupation forces of Japan. I have been assured by the Secretary of the Army that they are going there for the specific purpose of occupational duties in Japan. I know that the military situation may change and their use may be necessary for other purposes but, Mr. President, I was bitterly opposed to General MacArthur, as theater commander, taking any action or making any unauthorized commitment which might cause that magnificent group of Oklahomans to become the shock troops to open up a way for the armies of Chiang Kai-shek to reinvade the Chinese mainland.

I remind the distinguished Senators from California that California's Fortieth Division is already in Japan for the same purpose as Oklahoma's Forty-fifth Division. And it is beyond my comprehension that they could contemplate with favor the possibility of men from California thus being sacrificed in what could only be a futile and useless effort.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Oklahoma is not making the argument

on the floor, is he, that the National Guard divisions from Oklahoma and California should be in a sanctuary in Japan while other Americans from the other 46 States are meeting the whole might of Chinese communism on the Peninsula of Korea?

Mr. KERR. No. The sons of Oklahoma and California are in the Armed Forces of America. I do not ask any sanctuary for Oklahoma's fighting men wherever they may be; neither would I permit, if I could, their being uselessly thrown into an incinerator which would result in destroying them and helping no one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I challenge the Senator from Oklahoma to show us any place where General MacArthur has advocated American troops being used on the mainland of China. The general has suggested that there are more than 500,000 non-Communist troops on the island of Formosa, men representing the Republic of China, who could be used for commando raids on the long Chinese coastline and begin to build up some counterpressure so that the Chinese Communists could not devote all their efforts to destroying the United Nations forces in Korea. I challenge the Senator from Oklahoma to show that at this time or at any other time General MacArthur has advocated the landing of a major force of American ground troops on the continent of China.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is perfectly aware of the fact that General MacArthur has said that he and the forces which he now has and those which he said must be added to them could engage in an all-out struggle against China in Asia and settle the war there against communism. The Senator from California is perfectly aware of the fact that the only way Chiang's men can be taken to the mainland is for someone other than Chiang's men to get them there, because they could not stay there when they were already there.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I repeat, Mr. President, that we did not go to Korea to fight Red China. I realize the possibility that Red China can continue to send her armies into Korea, but when she does, Mr. President, she must send them against the armed forces of the United Nations. She is waging war on 52 nations, Mr. President, and she is waging a war she cannot win.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma recognize the fact that at the present time the United States of America is supplying more than 90 percent of the troops in the so-called collective security action in Korea, that it is suffering more than 90 percent of the casualties, and that when a proper investigation is made it will probably be shown that for the past 2 years the General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur,

has pleaded with the Department of Defense to send additional American troops to Japan so that the situation in the Far East may not develop further along the same line, but his plea has been continually rejected.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to answer one question at a time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well.

Mr. KERR. I am aware of the large percentage of troops which we have furnished in Korea. I am aware of the great casualties that have been suffered. In a few moments I shall devote my remarks to the monumental blunder committed by MacArthur which brought about a great many of the casualties. However, I remind the Senator from California that if we were to invade the mainland of China, we would go alone. In other words, we would have to furnish 100 percent of the men, air power, and all other armed forces. Even if we are suffering, as the Senator says, 90 percent of the casualties in Korea, it is still a limited engagement, and we are in a far better position in Korea to meet the added force of Red China, with the allied powers who are with us there, than we would be in if we had to continue with what we are doing in Korea and at the same time commit the monumental folly which MacArthur has said is necessary, of sending an independent, additional armed force from this country to the mainland of China.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think this debate is very important, and in it the American people have a great interest. I do not like to interrupt the Senator, but I think that perhaps sometimes we can—

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether he does not know that General MacArthur has consistently pleaded with the United Nations that they send additional troops to help support the collective security action; that he has continually pleaded with the United States to send additional troops if our allies would not bear their fair share of the burden; and that it was only after the United States announced we could not send any additional troops, and after our so-called allies in the so-called collective security action indicated that they were not going to send any more troops, that he finally looked around to see where there might be help available in the struggle in which we are now engaged, and he saw that there were 600,000 troops on the island of Formosa, troops of the Republic of China, which was one of the first nations to offer help in the collective security action? Does the Senator from Oklahoma believe under those circumstances General MacArthur should have turned his back on the possibility of getting some reinforcements?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma has stated his views very clearly on what he thought of the ability to help of Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalist armies. I repeat that Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalists were on the main-

land of China and abandoned their armaments by the ton and millions of dollars' worth. The Red Chinese forces are now using those armaments against us in North Korea. I say to the Senator from California that General MacArthur had the opportunity of getting from 125,000 to 250,000 additional fighting men in South Korea, who were already there. Senators on the other side of the aisle a little while ago complained because our Government had permitted the disbanding of 125,000 South Korean reservists. I read in today's Washington Post:

The third series (of communications between the Commander in Chief and MacArthur) concerned a proposal by the Joint Chiefs of Staff early this year for the rearmament of South Korean military forces. MacArthur's reply, as the document showed, was that such arms and munitions as were available should go to the Japanese police force.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator know that the administration, in order to substantiate a very weak case, has released a few documents which were heretofore classified as top secret, in order to support its doctrine in the action which they have taken against MacArthur—

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma did not yield—

Mr. KNOWLAND. When the fact of the matter is that—

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I did not yield for a statement by the Senator from California as to what the facts of the matter were.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask the Senator whether it is not a fact.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator desires to ask a question, let him ask it, and I shall try to answer it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator know that the quantity of arms which were offered to General MacArthur were furnished with an alternative? He had a certain limited amount of small arms. He had stripped the Japanese part of his occupation force. He had the choice of either trying to equip a Japanese police force of approximately 75,000 men, which within a short time may be much larger, or of equipping with small arms, only, the South Koreans. With the limited facilities available to him he was forced to make the choice between the two decisions. I wonder if the Senator does not think that under those circumstances, since Japan had been stripped bare, he made the only decision that a responsible commander could make? He was not told by the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "We are willing to send you all the arms you need to equip both the unequipped South Koreans and the Japanese police force."

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma yielded for a question, not a speech.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that question of the Senator.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is perfectly aware of the fact that in MacArthur's opinion he is the only man capable of making a decision, and that the only feasible or plausible pro-

gram was the one which he approved. I read from his answer, in which he said that the equipment should be used in Japan. He said:

Operations continue according to plan and schedule. We have now substantially cleared South Korea of organized Communist forces.

It was not on the basis of the greater need in Japan, but upon his assumption and statement that he had won the war in Korea. In a little while I shall refer to the most colossal military blunder of this age, when MacArthur during the offensive at the Yalu River, said he was going to have the men home by Christmas.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator feel that the President of the United States and the United States have a moral right to deny 500,000 Chinese now on Formosa an opportunity to go back into their own country, to defend their country and to fight for their country? The President of the United States is using our Navy to keep them from crossing the water from Formosa into the mainland of China? The question is: Does the Senator feel that the President of the United States has the right to do such a thing?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Indiana does not think the President of the United States has any right except one which MacArthur grants and MacArthur approves. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that the question he has raised has already been referred to by the Senator from Oklahoma and will be referred to again. The action we are committed to in the Far East is the stopping of aggression in South and North Korea, not the reestablishment of Chiang Kai-shek on the mainland of China.

Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that I do not know of any responsible military leader anywhere who thinks that Chiang Kai-shek and his men could be restored to the mainland and kept there without the use of greater military power and larger military forces than will be required to bring the commitment in North Korea to a successful conclusion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is evading my question.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma does not yield for a statement of what the Senator from Oklahoma is doing. The Senator from Indiana can address himself to that subject in his own time.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Indiana will do that; but I should like to ask the able Senator another question.

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the President of the United States, using the United States Navy, is prohibiting 500,000 Chinese Nationalist soldiers from returning from Formosa to the mainland of China to fight to defend their own



country, and drive the Communists out of their own country?

Mr. KERR. No; that is not a fact. The fact is that the President of the United States is using the United States fleet to keep the Red forces of China from invading Formosa and taking what little Chiang Kai-shek has left away from him.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that it is strictly against the rules of the Senate to show any sign of approval or disapproval, by applause or in any other way.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that when the President of the United States sent the Navy into Formosa waters, his instructions were to keep the Chinese Reds from invading Formosa, and to keep the Nationalists on the island of Formosa from returning to the mainland of China?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is aware of the wording of the President's order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did I state it correctly?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma has advised the Senator from Indiana not only as to his interpretation of the order, but as to what its practical result now is. The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to say further in answer to the question of the Senator from Indiana that it is not only incumbent upon this Nation to honor its commitment and win its objective in South Korea, but also, even over and beyond that, if it is humanly possible, it is the purpose of this Government to avoid being locked in a useless, endless land war in China. If the Senator from Indiana does not know that that is the purpose of General MacArthur, then he had better bring the general back to the United States and interview him.

In that regard—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KERR. In a moment. Let me finish.

In that regard, there has been submitted in the Senate a resolution asking authority to send 12 Senators to the Orient to find out what MacArthur's views and recommendations are. Let me say that if there is one Senator of the 96 who does not know what MacArthur's views and recommendations are, he has neither read the newspapers nor listened to the radio, nor to the declarations of policy made on the other side of the aisle.

It has been stated there, as it has been stated by MacArthur, that Asia is the place to win the war against communism. The Senator from Oklahoma does not agree with that fallacious contention. The Senator from Oklahoma subscribes to the belief and conviction—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. In a moment. The Senator interrupts me at a dramatic point.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Keep the "end man" quiet for about a minute, and I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma subscribes to and pronounces the conviction that it is to the interest of our country and its people to limit the war in Asia to the smallest territory possible, and to prevent, if humanly possible, either the spreading or carrying of that war to the mainland of Asia, maintaining the principal part of our rapidly growing strength as a deterrent against Russia starting a war, or to whip her if she does start one.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is Korea in Asia?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator is asking for information, the answer is yes. If he is making a rhetorical gesture, it is entirely useless.

Mr. CAPEHART. My next question is, Is there a war in Korea?

Mr. KERR. There is; and the Senator from Oklahoma wants to limit it to Korea, because the United Nations are winning the war in Korea. The United States alone cannot win a war against Red China in Red China; and if the Senator is not aware of the mutual assistance pact between Red China and Red Russia, whereby Red Russia has agreed to enter the war at the side of Red China in the event of an attack on Red China by any other force or power, then the Senator should read it. I shall address myself to that phase of the situation in a few moments.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for one more question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that Red China is fighting in Korea? Why does the Senator want to give Red China the right to fight in Korea, and deny the United States the right to fight in China? How does he expect to win the war against Red China, so long as we say—

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Indiana wants the United States to fight in Red China, why does he not introduce a joint resolution declaring war on Red China?

Mr. CAPEHART. We are fighting Red China now.

Mr. KERR. But not in Red China. We are fighting those parts of her forces which she is sending to Korea, and we are killing them by the tens of thousands.

Mr. CAPEHART. Korea is adjacent to Red China.

Mr. KERR. You do not say!

Mr. CAPEHART. It is like the relation between Maryland and Virginia. Yet the Senator would say to the United States forces, "You can fight in one little territory, but you dare not go outside

that territory to fight." How does the Senator expect to win the war?

Mr. KERR. Let me answer the Senator's question, if he wants information. We say to the United Nations' forces, "Fight and overcome and stop and punish aggression where it happens, wherever it rears its ugly head." That is in South Korea. We have made no commitment, declared no war, and made no undertaking to carry the war into Red China. Only MacArthur, among all the military leaders that I know, is today sufficiently stupid to recommend such a course; and I remind the Senator that last night, on the National Broadcasting Co. hookup, Morgan Beatty stated that on the 26th of last June General MacArthur himself made the following statement to Ambassador Dulles and two accredited news reporters:

Anybody who commits the land power of the United States on the Continent of Asia ought to have his head examined.

I say that I not only agree with that, but I believe that any man in a responsible position in our military forces who would do that which would amount to committing our land forces against Red China on the mainland of China not only ought to have his physical head examined, but ought to have his official head cut off.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not clear to the Senator from Oklahoma that the very frank statements of the Senator from Indiana show that he and his associates desire to embroil the United States and the United Nations in an all-out land war in Red China?

Mr. KERR. I must answer that question in the affirmative, but with the correction, that I am sure that the Senator from Indiana speaks only for himself.

I would not lay to the door of any man in or out of the United States Senate the awful, fearsome, fallacious project of engaging or permitting the engagement of this blessed country in a land war with China, unless that man specifically declares himself in favor of it. I understand the Senator from Indiana has so declared. However, he did not say that he would engage the United Nations in the land war against China. What he says amounts to engaging the United States alone in the all-out war against China.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the Senator said a moment ago that anyone who would advocate a war in Asia against the Chinese should have his head examined.

Mr. KERR. No; I did not say that. I quoted Douglas MacArthur, who said, "Anybody who commits the land power of the United States on the continent of Asia ought to have his head examined." And I said—

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me ask the Senator this question—

Mr. KERR. Just a moment. The Senator asked me a question. Now keep quiet for a moment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Very well.

Mr. KERR. I said that I not only agree that anybody who commits the land power of this Nation against Red China on the continent of Asia ought to have his physical head examined, but I said if he is a man in responsible military position and seeks to do that, he ought to have his official head cut off.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Indiana. I would miss him if he quit asking questions. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that Korea is a part of Asia, and is it not a fact—

Mr. KERR. Let me answer one question at a time. Korea is a part of Asia, but it is a peninsula, and is not included in what is referred to as the continent of Asia. The Senator from Oklahoma referred to the mainland.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me ask one other question. How do the able Senator from Oklahoma and the President expect to win the war in Korea?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma does not have the breadth, scope, and inclusive power the Senator from Indiana has. The Senator from Oklahoma can answer only for himself.

Mr. CAPEHART. Very well, answer the question. How does the Senator from Oklahoma expect to win it, or does he expect to take the troops out? Korea is a part of the mainland of Asia. We are fighting Red China today. Yet the Senator from Oklahoma stands on the floor of the Senate and tries to make the people believe that we are not fighting Red China; that Korea is not even in Asia.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma did not say that Korea was not even in Asia. He said it was not a part of the mainland of Asia.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is it a part of, then?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would remind the Senator from Indiana that our fighting North Korean troops and such troops as Red China has sent into Korea is far different from the situation if we were to provoke an all-out war against the mainland.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Red Chinese are fighting us. They are throwing everything they have at us.

Mr. KERR. Let me answer one of the Senator's questions before he asks another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield at this point.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. When I finish my answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Indiana I shall be glad to yield to the Senate from South Dakota.

The Senator from Indiana asked in what respect the situation in Korea was different from what it would be if we were fighting China on the mainland of China. I am reminded of a story—

Mr. CAPEHART. Whom are we fighting if we are not fighting China?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Indiana can restrain his impetuosity and

not add another question before I have an opportunity to answer the one he has already propounded, I shall endeavor to indulge him for such time, either as his desires permit or my physical abilities will enable me.

I started to say, I was reminded of the story of the boy who had hold of the cat's tail. His mother said, "Johnny, quit pulling the cat's tail." Johnny said, "Maw, I ain't a-pullin'. I'm just a-holdin'. The cat's doing the pullin'."

I want to say to the Senator from Indiana that we are holding our position in North Korea.

Mr. CAPEHART. How long are we going to hold it? How many more men are going to be killed in that operation?

Mr. KERR. Until Red China has had enough. We will fight her where we are winning, and not permit her or Russia or MacArthur or the Senator from Indiana to inveigle us into a position where we will be fighting her but cannot win.

Mr. CASE and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I was wondering if the Senator from Oklahoma would hold that the Peninsula of Florida is not a part of the mainland of the United States.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from South Dakota brings up a very pleasant subject. Yes, Florida is a part of the United States, and if the Senator from South Dakota does not know that, there will not be enough time during the afternoon to enable me to enlighten him. If we were engaged in a war defending this country, but were engaged only on the peninsula of Florida, in a limited engagement, with a limited commitment, we would be in far stronger position than we would be if we attempted to divert either the troops we had there or those that were required to make us stronger there, and sought to spread them over the millions of square miles of this great country. The same would be true, I remind the Senator from South Dakota, if we were to adopt, embrace, and follow the folly of MacArthur in his proposal to expand the war beyond the peninsula of Korea and take it throughout Asia.

Mr. CASE. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. KERR. Our purpose is to sustain our position, and win our commitment there, and not permit it to be spread all over the jungles of Asia.

Mr. CASE and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I am willing to yield to the Senator from South Dakota. I have yielded a number of times to the Senator from Indiana. The distinguished Senator from Indiana should be willing to have his colleague on the other side of the aisle yielded to.

Mr. CASE. It is not my understanding that General MacArthur has proposed to send a land army onto what the Senator

from Oklahoma has described as the mainland of Asia.

Mr. KERR. That reminds me of the man who proposed to a woman, but he did not say anything to her about having children. He simply said to her, "I want you to love me and marry me." But I wish to say that she would be a very simple and foolish woman if she did not contemplate that as an inevitable result of marriage she would be likely to become a mother.

Mr. CASE and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and is so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. It is my understanding that the suggestion by General MacArthur ran to being permitted to bomb the supply lines.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator from South Dakota to make a statement.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator from Oklahoma wants me to put it in the form of a question, very well.

Mr. KERR. The Senator asked me to yield for a question.

Mr. CASE. Very well. I will ask a question. May I refer to the Senator's remarks about our winning the war in China, and discussing how we would win it. I ask the Senator: With what would he win the war?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator wishes to base his question on a statement made by me, let us get it straight in the beginning. I said we were winning our war in Korea. Korea may be a part of the Continent of Asia, but I do not have to inform the Senator that it is not a part of China.

Mr. CASE. The question I wish to address to the Senator is this, Is he familiar with the statement by Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who has now been appointed to succeed General MacArthur, who, in the press of late Sunday and Monday, was quoted in this fashion:

Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway said yesterday that only a political settlement can win the Korean war. The commander of the United Nations ground forces said, "No end to the Korean war is in sight unless such a settlement is reached."

Mr. KERR. I read that.

Mr. CASE. And in view of that statement we are winning the war in Korea, are we?

Mr. KERR. If there is a word of truth in it—and I neither deny nor affirm it, but tentatively I accept it—I wish to say that it certainly does contradict the statement, the proposal, and the actions of MacArthur and of those on this floor who support him. I believe the Senator quoted Lieutenant General Ridgway as saying that it had to be a political victory. MacArthur has said that it would have to be a military victory against China; and then MacArthur went on to say—if I correctly recall—something like this; that he was fighting with arms and with men in Korea, and wanted to do so in China, and that in Europe they were only fighting with words.

Mr. President, I hope—

Mr. CASE. Will the Senator yield?



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. In the interest of orderly procedure, the Chair will ask all Senators to observe the rules. If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to ask a question, he should address the Chair, and should ask whether the Senator from Oklahoma will yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield, so that I may thank him for his courtesy?

Mr. KERR. I would receive the Senator's thanks, both for my courtesy and for my lack of it; but in doing so I would not deny myself the privilege of answering the question the Senator asked me.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in doing so; but I also wish to say that I appreciate the distinguished Senator's courtesy in yielding to me and in permitting me to ask a question, and in protecting me in my right to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator—

Mr. KERR. Just a moment, please; I ask Senators to have a little patience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I hope we never have a fighting war anywhere outside of Korea, and that if we have to engage with an enemy on any field other than that, it may be limited to an engagement of words. I hold with the distinguished former Senator Austin, our representative in the United Nations, that every day we succeed in limiting the enemy's action to an exchange of words represents a victory for us. I share his view that it is far better to let the diplomats have more ulcers and thereby make sure that the GI's will have less bullets.

Mr. President, I conclude my answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota by saying that I hope this great country, in achieving the abiding peace which is our over-all and final objective, will never have to send her sons to any other battlefield than the one on which they are now committed, and that they may end that commitment as soon as it is humanly possible to do so with honor, and that under no circumstances will we permit men with political ambitions or with political hatreds or with military jealousies to induce or seduce us into committing the irreparable folly of launching a land war against Red China.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Oklahoma is in agreement that we are fighting the Red Chinese in Korea?

Mr. KERR. What the Senator from Iowa asks, or what the Senator from Oklahoma says, does not add to or detract from the naked, raw facts with reference to the engagements in Korea. However, I take it that the Senator from Iowa has not permitted himself to become deceived or misled into believing

that at this time we are engaged against all of the military power Red China has. I do not believe that any responsible military authority or any informed diplomatic authority or any fair-minded legislator would believe or hold that at this time we are engaged in Korea with 10 percent of the fire power and the military power of Red China we would have to meet and overcome or retreat in the face of, if we committed the irreparable and unpardonable folly of carrying the war to Red China on the mainland.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may clarify my question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Iowa for a question. However, if he wishes to make a speech to clarify what he has said, I suggest that I shall be through in a little while, and then he may make any sort of speech he wishes to make by way of clarification.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I submit to the Senator from Oklahoma that I asked him a simple, short question. I should like to ask whether the Senator agrees that we are fighting Red Chinese troops in Korea.

Mr. KERR. I answered that question; and if the Senator from Iowa did not hear my answer, the Record will be at his disposal in the morning, and he can there enlighten himself.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KERR. I do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall ask whether it is true that the Senator quoted an alleged statement by General MacArthur, some time ago, to the effect that anyone who would commit American troops to land warfare on the mainland of China or in Asia should have his head examined.

Did I correctly understand that the Senator quoted that statement, approving the sentiment which it expressed and paraphrased?

Mr. KERR. What I said was stated, I thought, in the presence of the Senator from Iowa. If the Senator from Iowa did not understand those remarks, the Record containing them will be available to him in the morning.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for one more question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is not the Senator from Oklahoma aware that American arms and American forces and American lives were actually committed on the mainland of Asia by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States before the United Nations had ever authorized any such action? So I ask the Senator: Whose head should be examined?

Mr. KERR. I would say to the Senator from Iowa that I do not blame him for being in doubt about that, but I wish to say to him that so far as I am concerned, I will join him in a mutual protective alliance and embrace to see to it that they do not have to examine the

head of either the Senator from Iowa or the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for one more question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Are we to understand—

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I cannot presume to reply to any question in regard to what the Senator is to understand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it the policy of the administration, which the Senator from Oklahoma represents, that under no circumstances will we ever go outside of Korea to fight the Red Chinese?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma neither presumes to represent, nor permits himself to be placed in the position of representing, the policy of the administration. He speaks here for himself. A little while ago he said—and he is sorry the Senator from Indiana either did not hear it or has forgotten it—that if we permitted ourselves to be drawn into a land war against Red China on the mainland of Asia, it would be an awful misfortune, and if we permitted any responsible official to carelessly or purposely get us into that situation, it would be a terrible tragedy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the Senator feels that way about it, why does he not advocate the withdrawal of our troops at the moment from the mainland of Asia?

Mr. KERR. I would not deny the Senator from Indiana that privilege; nor is it necessary, to one who really has a sincere curiosity, to ask the Senator from Oklahoma that question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Is not the Senator from Oklahoma aware that General MacArthur's statement, made on the 26th of January, as to the examination of the head of someone who would send our troops to the continent of Asia, referred to sending troops to Korea? Was not that statement made with especial reference to the statement of Mr. Dulles regarding the sending of troops to Korea?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Ohio did not know that the statement made by MacArthur was alleged to have been made on the 26th of last June—

Mr. TAFT. I refer to the statement made the day after the attack on Korea.

Mr. KERR. That was not the 26th of January.

Mr. TAFT. It was when we were considering whether to send troops into Korea. Was not that the matter with reference to which the statement was made?

Mr. KERR. I do not think so, and the fact that the distinguished Senator approves what he believes to be MacArthur's purpose to carry the war into Asia is certainly definite proof that it was not what MacArthur was talking about.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. If I said January in my previous question, I meant to say June. Can the Senator point to any place where General MacArthur, or any Senator on this side, has at anytime advocated sending the American Army to the mainland of China, or has gone beyond two proposals, (1) that we release the troops of Chiang Kai-shek for use either in Korea or wherever else they may want to fight, and (2) that we bomb the installations on which the North Korean Army is now basing all its operations against American boys? Can the Senator point to any case where anyone has proposed any steps except those two?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma was on this floor on the 15th of January, when the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] quoted the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who now addresses himself to this question, to the effect that we might as well declare war on China. The Senator from Oklahoma was referring to just such remarks as that, as well as to the actions and statements of MacArthur, which have given the impression to national leaders and peoples around the world that there is a considerable school of thought in this country to that effect. If my great friend insists upon my becoming specific, I must say that he is the accepted and accredited leader of the group by whom the opinion is held that its Members believe that the way to win the war against communism is to support MacArthur in a mad charge onto the Continent of Asia, or that which would amount to just that.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I just heard the Senator from Ohio make the statement that no Member of this body has ever expressed himself as being in favor of engaging in an all-out land war in Red China.

Mr. TAFT. "Sending American soldiers to the mainland of China," were the words I used.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator will permit me to state that, about 2 or 3 months ago, in a television debate with the distinguished Senator from Indiana, the junior Senator from New York specifically asked the question, "Would you favor the United States engaging in an all-out war with Red China?", and the answer was a categorical "Yes, I would."

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator show me the courtesy of permitting me to answer that?

Mr. KERR. I will show myself the courtesy of addressing myself to those remarks, then I will extend the courtesy to the Senator from Ohio, and then to the Senator from Indiana.

I appreciate the remarks of the junior Senator from New York, and I must say

that while I did not view the television or hear the spoken word, I did hear the statement of the Senator from Ohio made on this floor this afternoon, and the only interpretation I could give to what he said was in accord with what the Senator from New York has now said was his spoken word.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. I ask the Senator again, can he show me any place where MacArthur or myself or any other Senator has gone beyond the proposal that we permit the Chiang troops to be used, and that we bomb Manchurian bases? I have not made the second proposal, but that proposal has been made. The Senator does not answer my question: Can he point to any place where anyone has taken that position? Is it not entirely a straw man which he has built up as the basis of his entire argument this afternoon?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma quoted the Senator from Oregon as saying that the Senator from Ohio had made the statement that we might as well declare war on China; and the Senator from Indiana has said things on this floor which amount to that. As I said a while ago, the whole tenor of the MacArthur campaign has been to get additional troops and the additional military power in that area to settle the war against communism in Asia.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator does not know that, I remind him that he had better find out, because the American people know it.

Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to correct the possible reference to the junior Senator from Indiana. If I said "junior Senator," I should have said the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator do me the courtesy now of answering the question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Indiana for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from New York is wrong in attempting to quote what I said. I will tell him exactly what I said. I said that yes, I would send American soldiers to kill those who were killing American soldiers, regardless of where they were. I still stand on that, and I am proud to stand on it.

Mr. KERR. I wish to thank the Senator from Indiana for making that clear statement, and I hope the Senator from Ohio heard him. I hope the world hears him, because that is what this argument is about. It is to keep from sending American boys into Red China.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. When MacArthur, without authority and in violation of orders, said and did what amounted to a pro-

posal and a threat to settle the war against communism in that way, and when he refused either to take back what he had said or refrain from saying it in the future, he had to be replaced by someone who would take orders from his superiors. I remind the Senator from Indiana that if anyone in the chain of command below MacArthur had shown the reckless disregard for military orders from MacArthur which MacArthur showed for everyone in the military chain above him, that man would not have lasted 30 seconds, let alone 9 months.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. When our boys are being attacked and killed every day how can the Senator defend the action of refusing to use 500,000 soldiers in any way they can be used? No one said anything about a major invasion by Chiang Kai-shek, but certainly it has been proposed that he be permitted to make raids on China and in that way at least divert two or three Chinese armies who otherwise might be killing American boys in Korea. How can the Senator defend the action which refuses to use 500,000 soldiers who are prepared to fight on our side in any way they can?

Mr. KERR. In the first place, the Senator from Oklahoma does not believe Chiang has 500,000 soldiers. He does not believe that they are prepared for use anywhere. He does not believe that they could hold the island of Formosa, unless he had the protection of the American people.

Mr. TAFT. How about trying it? What can America lose by trying it?

Mr. KERR. There are two things about that, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEELY. I make the point of order that two or more Senators cannot properly speak on this floor at the same time. The Senator from Oklahoma has been interrupted 20 times by members who in violation of the rule failed to address the Chair before asking their questions or making their long-winded observations. Henceforth I shall object to the Senator's yielding to any Senator for any purpose except that of asking a question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I desire to answer the question which the Senator has already asked.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator need the protection of the Senator from West Virginia? [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. No; the Senator from Oklahoma does not need it, but he loves the Senator from West Virginia for offering it, and honors the spirit in which he said what he did.

I now wish to answer the Senator from Ohio. He said, "Why not try it?" Mr. President, in the first place, our forces in Korea are under the United Nations. In the second place, they are not only under the United Nations, but are also under the Commander in Chief. I cannot imagine a more diabolical, dangerous, or



explosive situation than for a man with General MacArthur's propensities such as have been demonstrated, to be given either the authority or the permission to try those things without clearing them with his commanding officer and in violation of the orders he had.

My good friend from Ohio—

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Let me pay the Senator a tribute. He made a heroic and courageous fight on the floor to avoid the possibility of engaging Russia in a land war on the continent of Europe. How can he now recommend that we do that which would provoke us to engage ourselves in a land war with Red China on the continent of Asia, when he knows that under the mutual-assistance pact between Russia and China, Russia has made a commitment to come to the aid and rescue of China?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Can Russia possibly object to our using satellite troops when Russia is using satellite troops?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Ohio does not expect the Senator from Oklahoma, nor does the Senator from Oklahoma presume to be able, to answer a question as to what Russia may be expected to do.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Reference has been made to the forces of Chiang Kai-shek as satellite troops, and reference has been made to the possibility that the Chinese Nationalists would like to send them to the mainland. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know whether the Generalissimo has asked either General MacArthur, the United Nations, or the military forces of the United States to put one soldier on the mainland of China?

Mr. KERR. No; the Senator from Oklahoma does not know, and the only thing he has seen with reference to contact between MacArthur and Chiang Kai-shek was the picture which was made when Madam Chiang Kai-shek kissed and embraced MacArthur, after which MacArthur wanted to start an all-out war against Red China.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say, in answer to the Senator from New Mexico—

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I do not yield for the Senator to make a speech. If he wants to ask me a question, I shall yield for that purpose.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator know that the answer he made to the Senator from New Mexico is not correct, when he said—

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma neither made an answer which he knew was not correct nor did he make an answer that he did not positively think was correct; nor does he yield to the Senator from New Hampshire to propound such a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thought the Senator yielded for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, General MacArthur claimed that if we started a general war on Red China Russia would not come to her rescue. I wonder if he is just as certain about this as he was last fall when he sent the United Nations forces in North Korea in the offensive toward the Yalu River and told the American boys that they would be home by Christmas.

Mr. President, a great portion of the casualties suffered by the American Forces in North Korea resulted from that unfortunate and terrible blunder. I do not know how many thousand American GIs are sleeping in unmarked graves in North Korea from which they will never return. But most of them are silent but immutable evidence of the tragic mistake of the "Magnificent MacArthur," who told them that the Chinese Communists just across the Yalu River would not intervene.

Mr. President, the worst defeat that American troops have taken in my lifetime was the result of MacArthur's erroneous conclusion that Red China would not send her armies against our forces.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. In a few moments.

It may be, Mr. President, that MacArthur's present judgment that Russia would not come to the rescue of Red China if we attack her mainland is based upon the fact that if we committed this greater folly Russia would not have to intervene. We would thereby seal our own doom.

It may be, Mr. President, that MacArthur's conclusion about Russia's possible action is just as wrong as he was when he sat as a member of a general court martial and participated in the conviction of Gen. "Billy" Mitchell.

And, Mr. President, I believe he is just as mistaken now as he was when he led the Armed Forces of this Nation down Pennsylvania Avenue and fought the battle of Anacostia Flats against the veterans of World War I, who were here to petition their Government for help.

Mr. President, I know that General MacArthur has had a long and sometimes brilliant military career. I am also keenly aware of the fact that he has made tragic mistakes, but I say, Mr. President, that all the mistakes he has ever made rolled into one would not have equaled the awful blunder had he been permitted to provoke an all-out struggle between our country and Red China.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Oklahoma not know that the—

Mr. KERR. I wonder if the Senator from California will ask his question in the affirmative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma know that the plans to go to the Yalu River had the full approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. KERR. I have not had access to the records in that case, but any relationship between MacArthur's actions

and the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection with that incident or any other is purely coincidental.

Mr. President, at this point, with reference to the remarks and questions by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I desire to refer to an editorial published in the Washington Post of yesterday written by the distinguished commentator, Mr. Walter Lippmann.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to my delightful friend from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wondered whether the Senator from Oklahoma, when he commented upon the movement of General MacArthur's troops to the Yalu River, was familiar with the fact that the policy of the President was to make all Korea independent and united, and, therefore, if there was to be a united and independent Korea, it was necessary to move to the Yalu River. I should like to read the statement—

Mr. KERR. I will answer his question, but I do not yield to the Senator for the purpose of his reading anything.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know that the President, on the—

Mr. KERR. The Senator has asked a question.

Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator decline to yield?

Mr. KERR. I desire to answer the question which the distinguished Senator from Michigan has asked.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator answer the question?

Mr. KERR. The Senator would not be surprised if he could, and he would feel very sadly disappointed and surprised if he could not.

The Senator from Michigan can speak for himself with reference to what the President's policy has been. I am addressing myself to what the official conduct, actions, and language of MacArthur have been, and I say that the handling by MacArthur of the offensive against the forces on the Yalu River was a terrible blunder, that it resulted in the worst defeat the American armies have ever had in the whole history of the Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am endeavoring to answer the Senator's question. I may refer to General MacArthur's lack of coordination of command. I do not pose as a military expert. I gained only the rank of second lieutenant in World War I, and I managed to hold onto it for the duration; but I learned enough then to know that any time a general loses contact with his forces, or any time he permits them to become hopelessly split, without liaison and without intelligence, in an area where he either does not know where the enemy is or what he is going to do, and acts on any such basis, he is liable to have the terrible thing happen to him that happened to Magnificent MacArthur.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that in the bulletin of the Department of State dated September 11, 1950—

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma can say now that he has not read the bulletin; therefore, he is not familiar with what it says. If the Senator from Michigan wishes to introduce it into the RECORD, the Senator from Oklahoma suggests that the Senator from Michigan do so in his own time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator—

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I have yielded to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma yields to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Even assuming that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were aware of the plan to proceed to the Yalu River, will the Senator from Oklahoma not recall with me that it was not the Joint Chiefs of Staff or any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who issued the famous report that the enemy had been completely liquidated, that our troops would be home by Christmas?

Mr. KERR. "The boys will be home by Christmas." That remark was made by Magnificent MacArthur.

Mr. President, I should like to introduce into the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Eichelberger Opposes Bombing Manchuria," published in yesterday's Washington Star. It quotes General Eichelberger with reference to the folly of bombing Manchuria.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EICHELBERGER OPPOSES BOMBING MANCHURIA

WICHITA, KANS., April 10.—A former Army commander under General MacArthur said last night that bombing across the Yalu River in Manchuria could precipitate an all-out shooting war.

Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger said sending Chinese Nationalist forces into action in China could bring the same result.

General Eichelberger formerly commanded the Eighth Army in the Pacific and recently was head of occupation forces in Japan.

"I believe Stalin committed himself to protect China from attack when he succeeded in getting the Chinese Reds into action in Korea," General Eichelberger said.

The general added he believes use of Nationalist forces in China or bombing across the Yalu River would be interpreted as a direct threat to the Communist regime in China and therefore would be likely to bring Russia into the war.

America is not prepared to fight a war with Communist Russia, General Eichelberger said, and everything possible should be done to avoid all-out conflict at this time.

American factories must be given time to tool up, the general told a Wichita men's dinner-club audience.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, at this point I should like to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Senator and the General," written by Walter

Lippmann and published in a recent issue of the Washington Post. I read a portion of the article:

Senator TAFT ought to know, though apparently he does not, that Chiang's policy is not to invade China in order to relieve us in Korea. Chiang's policy is to get us into a general war with China in order to make certain that he can stay in Formosa and in the hope that General MacArthur would eventually put him back into power in China.

The argument about Chiang and his army is not at all, as Senator TAFT seems to think, about whether to accept or to refuse the assistance of an important military ally. If Chiang were an important military ally, nobody in his senses would refuse his assistance. But the fact of the matter is that there is serious doubt as to whether Chiang's army could even be relied upon to hold Formosa, and I do not believe that there is a responsible military man in the world who thinks it could invade China.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

#### THE SENATOR AND THE GENERAL

Senator TAFT is talking about Korea and Formosa in a way which sounds as if he had not understood General MacArthur.

The Senator seems to think that there are 800,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on Formosa who—if only we permitted it and gave them arms—would march onto the transports, would sail across the Formosa Straits, would land on the mainland, would invade Red China and "take the pressure off our boys fighting in Korea."

To the Senator it is, therefore, "tragic and ridiculous" not to use this gigantic military asset. Here we are hard pressed in Korea; there in Formosa is a huge army, an army bigger, he thinks than all the armies on both sides now fighting in Korea. All that this huge army lacks, he thinks, is "arms" and President Truman's permission to invade China and some United States naval and air assistance involving, the Senator thinks, no American infantry.

But who told Senator TAFT about this army on Formosa, and about how big it is, and about what arms it could use, and what it would take to have it invade China? Not General MacArthur in his many public pronouncements. The general has not said that Chiang and his troops on Formosa are able to decide the struggle in our favor. The general has not said, as Senator TAFT and Representative MARTIN seem to think, that if Chiang's men were helped to fight more, we would have to fight less.

What General MacArthur is arguing for is not less fighting by Americans in the Far East, but much more fighting by Americans in the Far East. He wants, as he wrote to Mr. MARTIN, to "follow the conventional pattern of meeting force with maximum counterforce." He wants to wage an all-out war against China instead of the localized war he is now waging in Korea. The general does not say, and obviously he does not believe, that this would be the comparatively easy little war, fought largely with Chiang's infantry which Senator TAFT is dreaming about. The war which the general is advocating is the great war which, he contends, would decide the world-wide conflict. He wants the third world war now and he wants to fight it in the Far East.

But what the Senator wants is not to get us deeper into a bigger war. He wants a way out of the war which is already too big for him, which as a matter of fact was already too big for him on the 25th of June. Because he wants less war, especially less war involving the infantry, the Senator has al-

lowed himself to believe that Chiang's army can take over and be a substitute for our ground troops.

There is a great difference, in fact all the difference in the world, between Senator TAFT's idea that Chiang could "take the pressure off our boys fighting in Korea" and General MacArthur's idea that this is the time and that the Far East is the place to join the issue with the Communist powers and seek a military decision.

Senator TAFT ought to know, though apparently he does not, that Chiang's policy is not to invade China in order to relieve us in Korea. Chiang's policy is to get us into a general war with China in order to make certain that he can stay in Formosa and in the hope that General MacArthur would eventually put him back into power in China.

The argument about Chiang and his army is not at all, as Senator TAFT seems to think, about whether to accept or to refuse the assistance of an important military ally. If Chiang were an important military ally, nobody in his senses would refuse his assistance. But the fact of the matter is that there is serious doubt as to whether Chiang's army could even be relied upon to hold Formosa, and I do not believe that there is a responsible military man in the world who thinks it could invade China.

The argument about Chiang is an argument about whether to enlarge the Korean war into a general war. Those who believe in a general war with China know perfectly well that if Chiang's army were able to invade China it would be only because there was an American Army in front of it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I think that those who advocate or who would tolerate such a policy, no matter what their position may be in the Senate or out of it, would hang around their necks an albatross of tragedy from which there could be no redemption in their lifetime.

America stands at the crossroads. This is a grave hour in the history of our country. We are in a life-and-death struggle with the godless forces of communism. We need everything we have, and all the support we can get to win this great fight.

We have now achieved unity in our Armed Forces in the Far East. I wish to pay a tribute to Lt. Gen. Matthew Ridgway. He has demonstrated in the rugged crucible of war his ability as a military commander and as a leader of men. His taking command of the United Nations forces in Korea marked the turning point. Our forces have been marching victoriously forward ever since.

The action of the President has resulted in unity among the United Nations. Our own country needs unity today as much as ever in her history, and I believe that we can, must, and will find it.

We must face up to the issues that confront us. We must work together for the security and welfare of this Nation and its people.

This country is bigger than any one man. The future of this country depends on the wise settlement of basic issues, not upon the outcome of clashes of personalities.

We were confronted with the issue of achieving our objectives with the United Nations in Korea, or permitting General MacArthur to launch an all-out war against Red China. That is what the argument is about, Mr. President. The



Republicans are making a lot of noise on this floor today, but they are dodging the real issue.

Senators on the other side of the aisle who have spoken the most and the loudest against a land war with Russia on the continent of Europe are now trying to glorify MacArthur, whose purpose was to get us into a land war with China on the continent of Asia with the certainty that it would have provoked an all-out struggle with Russia also. If they are sincere in what they say, if they believe that the future security of this Nation depends on following the MacArthur policy, let them put up or shut up. Let them submit a resolution—and it would not be without precedent—expressing it as the sense of the Senate that we should either declare war against Red China or do that which would amount to open warfare against her.

MacArthur said over and over again that he should be furnished with the men and material to carry the war into China. If the Republicans want that, let them say so. If they do not, their support of MacArthur is a mockery.

Mr. President, the American people do not want an all-out war with Red China. The American people want to avoid world war III, either with China or Russia, or both, if it is humanly and honorably possible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How far does the Senator from Oklahoma propose to go in the matter of unity with the United Nations? Has he seen the dispatch in the New York Times of this morning, according to which Great Britain is advocating bringing Communist China into the Japanese peace treaty negotiations and is agreeable to the turning over of 8,000,000 free people on the Island of Formosa to the Chinese Communists? Does the Senator advocate such British position?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is almost as much in disagreement occasionally with Great Britain as he is most of the time with MacArthur and some of the time with the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he believes that the United States should take a line to defend Japan in the event of Chinese Communist aggression against Japan.

Mr. KERR. I think that the United States, as a member of the United Nations, is committed to stopping aggression wherever it rears its head, and in any area for which we are responsible.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, as we consider the decision which has been made by the President of the United States, I think there is a tendency to become involved in emotional and personal considerations. Since such is the tendency, it seems to me that perhaps it would be wise for Members of the Senate at this time to consider objectively and factually what our differences are with

respect to the decision which the President has made, and on that basis to determine whether the decision was correct or incorrect; and what can be done about it if we find the decision was incorrect.

I note that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] in his remarks indicated his disagreement with General MacArthur—as he indicated, most of the time; and with my colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] some of the time. I note that he applied to General MacArthur the term "stupid." I note also that he commented to the effect that possibly political ambitions, hatred, or jealousy may have entered into General MacArthur's decisions and his recommendations as to our policy in the Far East.

Of course, the Senator from Oklahoma has a perfect right to appraise General MacArthur's activities in the light of the facts as he knows them at this time. However, I believe that today so far as the American people are concerned—and I noted that I am only indicating what I believe the people think; others may disagree with this appraisal—if a poll were to be taken among the people, a poll which might be more accurate than the ones taken before the elections of 1948, fully 80 percent of the people would be on the side of General MacArthur and not on the side of Mr. Acheson, who is supported by Mr. Truman in this controversy.

I have received today, as has my colleague [Mr. KNOWLAND], more than 500 telegrams. Of course, I know that they are not conclusive. But they are uninspired telegrams. They are telegrams which people sat down and wrote last night from California, at 10, 11, or 12 o'clock at night, or at 1, 2, or 3 o'clock in the morning. My colleague has indicated that he received two telegrams indicating approval of the President's action. I have received one out of 500 indicating approval of the President's action.

The Senator from Oklahoma, interestingly enough, has commented to the effect that he was speaking for the divisions from California and Oklahoma which are now in Japan or are going to Japan, and that he thought he was expressing as well the sentiments of those who were fighting in Korea. I hold in my hand some of the telegrams which I have received from those who have sons, brothers, or husbands in Korea. I read a typical example:

As the mother of one son killed in Korea and another on the way over, I would like MacArthur reinstated.

As I said, the telegrams which I have received, and the telegrams which Senators on the other side of the aisle have received, are possibly not conclusive as to what public opinion is on this issue. However, I think it is time to view the facts in this case in perspective. During the remarks by the Senator from Oklahoma, some of the facts were brought out. There are others which I should like to bring out briefly in my remarks at this time.

First of all, let us find out just why General MacArthur was removed from his position. Was it because he was a bad military commander? The Senator from Oklahoma has indicated that that was one of the reasons. I should suppose from the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma that that is an indication of the line which those who support the President's position will take in the future. They will proceed to take the military record of this man and pick it to pieces and destroy it, vilifying him in the process. Of course, his record will speak for itself. I might make one pertinent remark at this point. As I recall, the Senator from Oklahoma and other Members of this body who share his point of view recently raised their voices in sharp criticism of the position taken by those who were opposed to sending troops to Europe. As one who favored sending troops to Europe I can speak with complete objectivity on this point. They said that those who opposed the sending of troops to Europe were in effect questioning the military decision which had been made by General Eisenhower on this issue and that by doing so they were trying to set themselves up as military experts.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With respect to the evident program of vilification and attack upon General MacArthur's ability as a military commander which has been indicated today by those who attempt to sustain the President's position, I wonder if the Senator from California has read the statement of the President of the United States, whom General MacArthur's opponents are supporting, to the effect that General MacArthur's place in history as one of our greatest commanders is fully established. The President stated that the Nation owed General MacArthur a debt of gratitude, and repeated his feeling of regret that he had to relieve him.

My question is: What position are those who arbitrarily attempt to attack and vilify General MacArthur and his record going to take in view of the fact that the man whom they are trying to support stated this morning that General MacArthur had firmly established his place as one of the greatest commanders in our history?

Mr. NIXON. I thank the Senator for his contribution. All I can say at this point in answer to the question which he has raised is that those, including the Senator from Oklahoma, who were so critical of any suggestion that we should question military recommendations by our commanders in the field and elsewhere during the troops-for-Europe debate, are now the first to rise and question the military decisions which General MacArthur made in Korea.

I think it might be well, in view of the distinguished record of General MacArthur, which the Senator from Iowa has so well pointed up by quoting from the President of the United States, for us to reserve judgment on whether or

not General MacArthur should be removed from his position because he is a bad military commander, until he has an opportunity to come home and present his side of the issue.

I trust that those who had such high regard for the statements of our military leaders in the troops-for-Europe debate will also have the same high regard for the statements of General MacArthur when he gives the military background of the Korean action.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from California feel that in the effort to get at the bottom of whatever led to the dismissal of General MacArthur, an investigation should be made as to what consultation was had with other nations which are contributing to the United Nations armed forces in Korea? We should know what consultation, if any, was entered into and whether any of those nations insisted upon the dismissal of General MacArthur. Personally I do not know what authority President Truman has to dismiss the commander in chief of the United Nations armed forces in Korea, though I presume there may be some document which gives him such authority.

Mr. NIXON. I completely agree with the Senator from Vermont. I believe it would be well to know which nations supported the dismissal of General MacArthur, assuming that they were consulted, and which nations favored his retention.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to join my colleague from California in his expression of regret that the great issue which is before the Congress could not be discussed calmly, without muckraking and mud slinging at one of the great commanders in American history, an officer who, not only in one war, but in two wars, rendered outstanding service to his country.

Appropos of the point raised by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] I wonder if the Senator knows that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 22, 1950, there appeared a speech by the then senior Senator from Florida, Mr. Pepper. I should like to quote briefly from that speech, because I think it fits in with the statement contributed by the Senator from Iowa, in which he quoted the President of the United States.

This is former Senator Pepper speaking:

Mrs. Pepper and I went on to Japan, to Tokyo, and were there from November 1 to November 28. I must say I did not appreciate the magnificence of the job done in Japan by General MacArthur, until I got a chance to see something of it by personal inquiry and observation. I made a statement in Tokyo, which I am glad to repeat here in the Senate, that I had known before that General MacArthur was regarded as one of the great generals of history—and I have not changed my mind about it, by reason of recent reverses—but I had to discover in Japan that he was also entitled to be called one of the great statesmen of history; for, today, his work in Japan

speaks for itself. In the first place, when the Korean attack occurred and our forces had to be thrown immediately into Korea, General MacArthur had practically to strip Japan of all our military forces there in order to send those forces at once to Korea. Yet there was never any threat of aggression or uprising, or in any sense of the word violence from the people or from the Government of Japan. On the contrary, we have not had the slightest feeling of insecurity of our administration there, however much we have found it necessary under the emergency to strip Japan of our occupying forces.

Mr. NIXON. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

So I say, Mr. President, that the real reason for this decision was not the fact that there was a question as to General MacArthur's capabilities as a military commander. In any event we certainly should reserve judgment on that point until all the facts are in.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from California has referred to the question whether or not there have been consultations with the other nations participating in a minor degree in the Korean episode. I note in today's newspaper a dispatch from London, in which appears the following:

The announcement broke before most of Europe was awake, but the tone of editorials and official comment in the past week left little doubt how Britain and the Continent would take the news.

The British Government appeared to have had either some advance notice of Truman's action or at least some advance inkling that the President was considering such a move.

I am inclined to believe—and I ask the Senator from California whether he agrees—that this policy was largely determined in England rather than in the United States, and that in this instance, as he has in so many other instances, Secretary Acheson followed the dictates from London rather than from the people of the United States.

Mr. NIXON. In answer to the Senator from Ohio I will say that I do not know what dictated this particular decision, but I do know that, whether it may or may not be a coincidence, certainly the British for the past few months have been requesting that General MacArthur either be reprimanded or controlled or discharged.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it the Senator from California is familiar with the fact that the troops of the United States were sent into Korea by the President of the United States without consultation with any Members of Congress, particularly without consultation with Members on the Republican side; and, furthermore, that on the first of September last the President delivered by radio an address from the White House, which was released to the press by the White House on the same day, and which is published in the State Department bulletin of September 11, 1950. The topic of the address was Aims and Objectives in Resisting Aggression in Korea, and in it, as appears on page 409 of the bulle-

tin, among other things, the President said:

Second. We believe Koreans have a right to be free, independent, and united as they want to be, and, under the direction and guidance of the United Nations we, with other nations, will do our part to help them enjoy that right. The United States has no other aim in Korea.

Now for my question. The President having sent the troops to Korea without consultation, having made the statement as to the objective of the United States and the United Nations in Korea, namely, that all of Korea should be free, independent, and united, if General MacArthur were operating to attain such an objective, he would have the right to go to the Yalu River, for there would not be any other way to make Korea free, independent, and united, would he not?

Mr. NIXON. The Senator from Michigan is correct. For General MacArthur to carry out the directive from the United Nations under which he was operating, he had to do exactly what he did, as the Senator from Michigan has indicated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the purpose of war to take away from the enemy the power to resist the will of the nation with which the enemy has gone to war? In other words, our purpose was to accomplish the aim stated, and in order to do it by war it was necessary to deprive the North Koreans, who are in war, of the power to resist the attainment of the objective which the President announced on the first day of September of last year.

Mr. NIXON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The purpose of my questioning the Senator from California is that I feel it highly important that we find out whether or not the dismissal of General MacArthur was due to the insistence of Great Britain. I did not intend to mention any country by name, but it has been brought out pretty well into the open by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. General MacArthur's dismissal coincides so closely with the statement released by the British Government yesterday that Red China must be consulted in arriving at any treaty with Japan, and that any treaty must contain a provision that Formosa will be ultimately returned to China, as to give the whole thing a highly suspicious atmosphere, indicating that perhaps Great Britain did insist upon the dismissal of General MacArthur. His recent letter to Representative MARTIN, of the House of Representatives, carries intimations and inferences which I believe to be quite contrary to the British foreign policy in Asia, and for that reason I, for one, would like to know what pressure may have been put upon the President by Great Britain or any other nation to bring about General MacArthur's removal. Great Britain may not have been the only one; there may have been 20 others.



Mr. NIXON. I appreciate the contribution the Senator has made, and I should comment on his statement in this manner. Regardless of which nation or nations were responsible for influencing the decision made by the President dismissing General MacArthur, it seems to me that at the present time the American people, as they consider the actions which we have taken in the past in relation to the conflict in Korea, perhaps would support the proposition that in the future our diplomats should be instructed, in their deliberations with our allies in Korea, to give the same weight to their suggestions and their advice as to what our policy should be in Korea, as the contributions in troops from those allies bear to our own contribution in Korea. When we bear in mind the fact that at the present time 90 percent of the U. N. troops, exclusive of the South Koreans, are our own, that 90 percent of the casualties are ours, since we have made the greatest part of the contribution proportionately, and since we are assuming the greatest portion of the risk, certainly the decision made to dismiss General MacArthur, or any other decision affecting the course of the Korean action, should be primarily an American decision, with consultation and advice, it is true, with all our allies, but certainly not taking dictation from any one of them.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President—

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from California agree with me that, judging from the picture as we see it in respect to the attitude of England in connection with this matter, and judging from comments appearing in the press and comments made by members of Parliament themselves, the indications are that England's interest in the Korean affair and in the entire oriental picture is more for the purpose of protecting her trade with Communist China than it is for the purpose of protecting the lives of the American boys in Korea who are fighting against communism?

Mr. NIXON. I agree with the Senator that the facts as we know them would lead to that conclusion.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question of the Senator from California, if he will yield.

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from California said he had received several telegrams, and that one of them was favorable to the position of the President. I wish to advise the Senator from California that I have received many telegrams, but not one of them is favorable to the position the President has taken; to the contrary, all of them signify support of General MacArthur.

Mr. NIXON. At this point, let me say to the Senator from Ohio that a number of people have moved from Ohio to California, and I trust that the telegram he has mentioned, which I received, did not come from a former resident of Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Judging from the communications I receive from Ohio, by way of both telephone and telegram, I doubt very much whether anyone hav-

ing that attitude would have gone from Ohio to the fair State of California. [Laughter.]

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, since this decision was not made by reason of the military incompetence of General MacArthur, then the reason must have been differences over policy as to how to bring to a successful conclusion the Korean war. The suggestion has been made here, today, that the choice, insofar as the decision to relieve General MacArthur was concerned, was one between keeping the war a small war, a so-called cheap war, or making it develop into a much larger war on the continent of Asia.

I do not think that is the choice. As we determine whose advice we should take at this point, and when we consider whether the recommendations of General MacArthur would, if adopted, end the war in Korea at the least cost of men and money to the United States, and consider his recommendations as against those of Secretary of State Acheson and others in the State Department, I think it is well for us to review the records of the individuals between whom we have to choose.

I wonder whether the Members of the Senate have thought today, as I have been thinking, of what has happened in the Far East in the past 5 years—what has happened, as a matter of fact, to the international position of the United States.

Five years ago the United States came out of World War II without question the most powerful nation on the face of the globe. We had the strongest Army, we have the strongest Navy, we had the strongest Air Force. We had a monopoly on the atomic bomb, and we had the great majority of the people in the world on our side. There were approximately 180,000,000 people on the Communist side, and there were 1,760,000,000 people on our side.

Since that time, 5 years have passed—5 years of conferences and of limited, so-called cheap wars, such as the one in Korea. What is the situation today? Today we no longer have a monopoly on the atomic bomb. Today we no longer are stronger on the ground. Possibly we are stronger in the air. We are stronger on the sea. We are weaker under the sea.

And when we consider the lineup of the people of the world, what do we find? We find that today there are only 540,000,000 people on our side; there are 800,000,000 people on the Communist side, and there are 600,000,000 people who have to be classified as neutral—the people of countries such as India, Pakistan, and the like.

In other words 5 years ago, at the conclusion of the most costly war in all our history, the odds, in terms of numbers of people in the world, were 9 to 1 in our favor, but today they are 5 to 3 against us.

So today the decision before the Senate and before the country is whether we should continue to support the policies of those who have been responsible for our foreign policy during this 5-year period, or whether we should ask

for and follow advice from others—whether we should, for example, consider what General MacArthur offers as a possible solution of the Korean war, and to consider it for the reason that those who are making our policy today are the same ones who failed so miserably in the past.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. At this particular point, I wonder whether the Senator from California recalls General Marshall's mission to China in 1945. Does the Senator recall that mission?

Mr. NIXON. I do.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator from California remember what the outcome of that mission was?

Mr. NIXON. I do.

Mr. JENNER. Is not that a part of the picture the Senator is presenting—in other words, is not that where some of the 800,000,000 people came from?

Mr. NIXON. In answer to the Senator from Indiana I may say that the results speak for themselves. Certainly, so far as the results are concerned, the United States has been the loser, because 400,000,000 of the 800,000,000 people behind the iron curtain are in China.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from California to yield further, if he will.

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I wish to ask the Senator whether he thinks Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States, would make the decision he announced early this morning unless he had consulted the same George Catlett Marshall who was responsible for the mission to China, and who now is the Secretary of Defense of the United States?

Mr. NIXON. I do not know whom the President consulted, either here or abroad.

Mr. JENNER. I know the Senator from California does not know that; but would he think—

Mr. NIXON. If the Senator will permit me to answer further—

Mr. JENNER. Certainly.

Mr. NIXON. But I do know that those who have been responsible for our foreign policy in the Far East have failed, and it is time for a new policy. The American people have had enough of our past policy in the Far East, and that is why I say the American people and the Congress want to hear from General MacArthur on that point.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the Senator if it is true that the same men and the same policy makers who have betrayed this country's interest in the past are still riding herd on the American people today? Does the Senator from California agree as to that?

Mr. NIXON. All I can say is that certainly those who have been responsible for the failure of our policy in the Far East in the past 5 years have constantly been critical of General MacArthur in the past, and I would assume

that they are very happy about his discharge today.

Mr. JENNER. And they are still the policy makers in our Government today, are they not?

Mr. NIXON. That might be a reasonable conclusion.

Mr. JENNER. Exactly. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the Senator from California whether he thinks that because of a lack of forthrightness in establishing a policy in Korea and in the Asiatic area, General MacArthur felt disposed at least to be forthright with the American people and to ask for a determination of policy at the earliest possible time.

Mr. NIXON. That is not only true, I may say to the Senator from Kansas, but I think it is most interesting to note that General MacArthur's successor, General Ridgway, is of exactly the same opinion as General MacArthur. For example, he said just 2 days ago—and I quote from an editorial appearing in the Washington News:

I see no end to the military operations unless there is a political settlement. I have no personal knowledge of negotiations for a political settlement.

Of course that is a complete answer to the ridiculous proposition made on this floor today to the effect that if we continue to fight in Korea, eventually the Communist Chinese will become tired and quit.

That is exactly what General MacArthur has asked for—the right to mount an effective and decisive military operation which will force a political settlement. General Ridgway has in effect said the same thing. I wonder what the President of the United States will do to him if General Ridgway continues in that viewpoint.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Does not the distinguished Senator from California further think that General MacArthur has rendered to the rank and file of the people of the United States a signal service in bringing some of this information to the attention of the people, so that at least we may know, at the earliest possible date, where we are going, and why?

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator further, whether he does not agree with me that because of the forthrightness of General MacArthur, a group which was anti-MacArthur insisted that the President should have taken the kind of action just announced?

Mr. NIXON. My answer to both the questions of the Senator from Kansas is in the affirmative.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wonder whether the Senator agrees with me that

there is peculiar significance in a series of events which have happened, and whether those events do not establish pretty clearly that the administration, which means the President, General Marshall, and Secretary Acheson, more than 5 years ago, actually adopted a policy toward China which is still in effect? These are the circumstances: General Marshall went to China to attempt to have the Nationalist Government of China surrender, in effect, to the Reds, by proposing and insisting that the Nationalist Chinese Government surrender at least a substantial part of its sovereignty to the Communist Chinese. That is No. 1. Next, when Chiang Kai-shek would not surrender free China to the domination of the Reds, great irritation was expressed by the administration for a period of a year or so, and thereafter, the Lattimore policy became apparent in this country, a policy not only of surrendering China to the Reds, but of getting out of Korea—getting out, as he expressed it, by not letting it look as though we pushed them into communism—and of eventual surrender and abandonment of Japan. I submit to the Senator the question whether those events, and many other collateral events, do not indicate that the present administration actually adopted as its foreign policy toward China, a policy of eventual surrender and capitulation to Communist China, which means the Kremlin, and which in the long run will mean the inevitable surrender of Japan, or the abandonment of Japan, and the inevitable loss of our entire position in the Orient? I ask the Senator whether there are not reasonable and powerful arguments which may support that thesis?

Mr. NIXON. I would answer the Senator from Iowa in this way: I noted with interest the comment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the effect that—and I quote exactly, having taken it down as he spoke—"Asia is not the place to defeat communism in a war." Let me answer that comment by stating the alternative. Asia may not be the place to defeat communism in a war, but Asia is a place where we can lose to communism without a war, and it is a place where we can lose to communism with a war—either way.

What has been the great error in the State Department's policy in the past 5 years? Let me say at the outset that I have been one of those who have supported much of the State Department's policy in Europe. So far as the policy in China is concerned, and in the Orient, I feel that the facts speak for themselves. That policy did not deserve support then, it does not deserve it now, because the policy has failed; and it has failed because of a basic error in the State Department, the error of taking the advice of men, who whether knowingly or unknowingly came to the false conclusion that Chinese Communists were somehow different from other Communists, that Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers and liberals, and therefore it did not make any difference whether China went Communist. As a result, the effort which we naturally would have ex-

pended had we recognized the danger and the true character of the Chinese Communists, was not made—the all-out effort to support the Nationalist forces in China.

The result was twofold—first, the fall of China and second, the war in Korea.

When we speak of the responsibility for the war in Korea let us remember that the Korean war would never have happened had not China gone Communist, because the North Koreans would never have dared to move south unless they had a friendly government on their northern border; but, when China went Communist, the Korean war became inevitable. I mean by that, the basic mistake which our policy makers made in the first instance was the failure to recognize the true character of the Communist Chinese and to take effective action against them; and now, since we are confronted with the Korean war, the question is—shall we persist in that mistake? That is why I say that those who have been responsible for advocating that mistaken policy in the past should be the ones who should be removed from their position rather than General MacArthur, who has been critical of that mistaken policy in the past. That is the issue before us today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator whether he is not aware that the policy to which I referred a moment ago was further implemented by the fact that we withdrew material support to Chiang Kai-shek for more than 10 months, after the shooting stopped following World War II; that, so far as the war was concerned, we withdrew our help for 10 months, and then, through the device of denying export permits for munitions, after the Congress had acted ordering aid to be given to the Chinese Nationalists, our help was withheld for another 10 months, or a total of 20 months, without any kind of aid whatever going to the Nationalist Chinese Army although we knew full well that meanwhile the Communists were receiving from the Russians the Japanese arms and equipment which had been captured.

Mr. NIXON. As a direct result, I may say, of that action on the part of our State Department and our Government, China did go Communist. If the action referred to had not been taken, and if other action had been taken which should have been taken at that time, the Chinese Nationalists might still be fighting against the Chinese Communists on the mainland, and the Korean war, with its 60,000 casualties, would never have happened.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator not think it significant that a little more than a year ago, I believe a year ago in January, as a matter of fact, the State Department and the President, or



the President through the State Department, made the famous announcement that Korea was not within our perimeter of defense, in the light of a policy of day-by-day and week-by-week surrender to the Communist forces in China? Did that not have some significance in connection with the beginning of the Korean war?

Mr. NIXON. As I recall the statement, it was that Korea and Formosa lay outside the defense perimeter of the United States of America; and what could we expect under those circumstances, except the attack which occurred?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator from California will yield for one more question, I should like to ask whether he attaches any significance to the fact that the British, who are ensconced in Hong Kong—through which port, incidentally, strategic materials are daily flowing to the North China Reds—recognized Red China well over a year ago, but have not yet had the compliment of having the Red Chinese recognize the British. Is there any significance in the fact that the British have been constantly dragging their feet in the United Nations' effort in North Korea, and insisting, "No, no, we must not cross the 50-yard line in this ball game, that we must play in our own field and cannot approach the other fellow's goal?" Is there any significance in the fact that the British are using American lives and property to protect certain commercial interests on the little island of Hong Kong as a gateway to Asia for British profit enterprise?

I ask the Senator if he attaches any significance to the British attitude on that point, and to the very strange and suddenly inspired criticism of MacArthur which broke out in England approximately 2 months ago.

Mr. NIXON. For whatever reason that criticism may have been made, all I say is that, from the standpoint of this Nation, from the standpoint of our troops fighting in Korea, I believe the decision which has been made is a wrong one. It is wrong for the reason which I have mentioned and for another which I am about to mention, the first reason being that by making that decision we have cast our lot with those who have failed in our foreign-policy decisions in the past 5 years and have turned down the advice of those who have criticized those wrong decisions.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I wonder if the Senator would agree with me that the whole world is quite familiar with the doctrines and the policies of Dean Acheson and General MacArthur, and would not the Senator agree with me that today has been a great victory for Dean Acheson and his policies?

Mr. NIXON. Let me say to the Senator that today certainly is a great victory for the policies of Dean Acheson and for those persons in the United States and in the world who support those policies and who oppose the policies of his critics.

I might add a further word at this point. I attach no implications to anyone's motives in adding this observation, but it is significant to me that in the past 10 years the Communist press in this country and the Communist press abroad has been doing a "hatchet job" on General MacArthur. They have been his most violent critics. If any group in this Nation is happy today over the action of the President, the Communists and the stooges for the Communists are happy, because the President has given them exactly what they have been after—General MacArthur's scalp.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is the Senator not wondering what the leaders in Japan and in the Arab countries, around the Mediterranean Sea, and elsewhere in the world, are thinking about as to what the future policy of the United States is going to be? Are we going to abandon completely the policy of no compromise with communism, as practiced by MacArthur, and turn permanently to that of Acheson's—one which in my opinion means appeasement and more appeasement?

Does it mean that the leaders of nations such as Japan or Germany will think that from now on they better start being more compromising with Russia to keep in step with a possible new American policy?

Mr. NIXON. I am glad the Senator brought up that point, because it is a point which I desire to discuss as I conclude.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. In order to bring one matter down to date, and to emphasize its impact upon the present thinking and possibly the decision of the President of the United States in the wee hours of the morning, let me ask who was the chief advocate of the philosophy that the Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers, if the Senator remembers.

Mr. NIXON. I think it was Mr. Lattimore.

Mr. BRICKER. And Mr. Jessup, as well?

Mr. NIXON. I think so; and Mr. Jessup and Mr. Lattimore are only two members of the whole clique which has constantly held to that theory in the past, and some even hold to it today.

Mr. BRICKER. They are two of the most vocal leaders of that group.

Mr. NIXON. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator know that it was Jessup who went with the President of the United States to meet General MacArthur at the conference held on Wake Island a short time ago?

Mr. NIXON. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. Evidently the philosophy of Jessup and Lattimore still dominates the policies of the President of the United States.

Mr. NIXON. There is no question that it meets with the approval of the anti-MacArthur bloc. It means the

pro-Lattimore-Jessup bloc in the State Department has prevailed.

Mr. BRICKER. One further question, if the Senator will yield, which I ask to elicit information, because I was only confused and confounded by the presentation of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] with regard to the plans and policies. I am inclined to ask the question because of the message sent to this country a few weeks ago by General Ridgway, who has now been placed in command, in which he said, in effect: "We have no definite purpose; we have no instructions; we do not know what we are going to do, but we are engaged in Operation Killer. We are simply killing without program or preparation." Does the Senator agree with me that that is a mighty low position for a great free country, such as America, to take?

Mr. NIXON. I certainly agree with the Senator from Ohio on that point, and I am very happy to have noted General Ridgway's statement to the effect that he, too, like General MacArthur, recognizes the necessity for bringing this war to a conclusion. I will say that the question of the Senator from Ohio fills in very well with the question asked by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] because, as I recall the question of the Senator from North Dakota, he asked what kind of a policy we are going to have in the Far East and what can the nations which are our allies expect?

I might say at this point that there are many of us, I know, who would like to know what that policy is. I am sure that those who are fighting in Korea would like to know what it is.

I am sure that there are those in Tokyo and Japan at the present time, who may go to Korea, who are wondering what that policy is. For that reason I think it might be well to see just what the policy of our State Department will be, now that General MacArthur has been removed from his command.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Many Members of the Senate are wondering, along with the people of Korea and other places in the world, what the policy of the United States really is.

Mr. NIXON. That is what I should like to comment on briefly at this point. It seems to me that the theory of the State Department, the theory of the administration, was very well summed up, significantly enough, by an article in the current issue of the United States News. I should like to read from that summary:

United States policy in Asia right now is confused, at cross-purposes.

Truman idea is that Korea is a local, United Nations war. Truman view is that Chinese armies, inflicting 1,400 casualties per week on Americans, are not really Communist Chinese at all so long as UN doesn't say they are. So United States Air Force cannot bomb bases where a Communist build-up goes on. Troops offered by Chiang Kai-shek cannot be accepted. Diversions inside China must be avoided on the theory that the Chinese Communists aren't at war at all.

MacArthur's idea is that war is war. MacArthur points out that American boys are being killed while diplomats argue whether a war is a war. Bombing of bases in Manchuria, blockade of Chinese ports, aids for guerrillas working in China and for Chiang's forces on Formosa is the MacArthur formula. In war, military objective is to try to aim blows at the heart of enemy power to try to get a decision. U. N. forces cannot win under present rules.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from California one further question. Would he be greatly surprised or astounded if in the very near future there should emanate from the State Department the beginning of propaganda over the country stating the inevitability of the necessity of recognizing Red China and seating Red China in the United Nations, the surrender of Formosa, and following the pattern toward which, in my opinion, the Lattimore-Jessup-Acheson policies have been directed?

Mr. NIXON. I intend to comment upon that point now.

Mr. President, apparently we can safely say that at this time the policy of the State Department—and that means the policy of the administration—is:

This is a cheap war in Korea. After all we are only losing 1,400 casualties a week.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has pointed out time and time again the Chinese Communists are losing thousands of their men. Therefore it somehow becomes a good war.

So far as getting the war over with and so far as bringing it to a successful military conclusion are concerned, we need not be in too much of a hurry. All we need to do is to continue to keep the pressure on. We are losing only 1,400 men a week and the Communists are losing 5,000 a week. We can hope that eventually they will see the light, and surrender.

Mr. President, I do not agree with such a theory. I say that any war in which an American boy dies is not a cheap war. I say it is the obligation of the Members of the Senate and the Members of Congress to do what they can to support a policy which will bring such a war to a successful conclusion.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator realize that the casualties in the Korean war during the past 9 months are equal in number to the casualties we suffered during the first year of the Second World War?

Mr. NIXON. Yes; in the first full year, 1942, as I understand. It brings home the point I was attempting to make. Since it is the theory of the administration that this is a cheap war, and we can let it go on without attempting to bring it to a military or political conclusion, what are we confronted with, so far as future policy is concerned?

We can wait and see what the United Nations are going to do. With respect to that point I should like to comment briefly on the resolution which was

adopted by the Senate only a few months ago. Senators will recall that we asked the United Nations to condemn Communist China as an aggressor. Senators will also recall that the United Nations did take such action. The point is: What has been done in implementation of such action? Very few additional troops have been sent to Korea to assist our troops there. There has been no discontinuance of trade in war materials and other materials through Hong Kong, which feed the Chinese war machine. There has been no clarification of the directives to our troops, to the U. N. forces, or to General MacArthur, indicating what should be done, either in crossing the thirty-eighth parallel or in going beyond the Yalu River; or with respect to any of the other decisions which General MacArthur must make on the field, and which he has not been able to make because his hands were tied by the political directives under which he has been operating.

Therefore, it seems to me that so far as action by the United Nations is concerned, the time has come for implementing the resolution. I may say that it was for the implementation of the resolution that General MacArthur was asking. He was asking for it, because he recognized that that was the way to bring the war to a conclusion. If we continue in the present stalemate, if we continue to follow the present leadership of the State Department, all we can expect is a continuance of the war. This nails down the point which the Senator from Oklahoma was trying to make. He said the choice was between peace and a big war in China. Mr. President, that is not the choice. The choice is whether we are to continue the war without any prospects or hopes of bringing it to an end with concerted United Nations action, or whether we are to insist on action which would allow our American military commander in the field to bring the war to a successful conclusion at the earliest possible date.

General MacArthur supports the second position. I support it also. I think the American people support it too, particularly as they see our casualty lists mount week after week.

The prospect of ending the war if we follow our present policy comes down to this: We are not going to end it on the field with a military victory. General Ridgway himself does not think it is possible to do so, until some political decisions have been made. What are the possibilities of ending it by political decisions and what should those decisions be? Certainly they will not be the political decisions which General MacArthur would advise.

Possibly what we can expect has already been indicated. Several times today we heard read on the floor of the Senate news releases concerning the fact that the British have now come out officially for the return of Formosa to China. That is the first half of the deal which is being considered as a means to bring the war to a "successful" conclusion. I put the word "successful" in quotation marks. The other half is that it will be necessary to recognize the government of

Communist China and admit it to the United Nations.

Therefore, Mr. President, the only plan the administration can offer to bring the war to an end is one of barefaced appeasement, because recognition of Red China and giving up Formosa to Communist China is nothing but appeasement. That is the alternative we face.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that every military authority in this country worth his salt has stated in one way or another that Formosa in hostile hands would make our position in the Orient untenable? Perhaps I should withdraw the statement that every military man worth his salt has so stated. I do not know whether every military man has stated it, but a very large number have.

Mr. NIXON. Let me comment on the Senator's statement in this fashion. I return to the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma, to the effect that China is not the place in which to defeat the Communists in a war. Senators will recall that my comment on the point was that China may not be the place in which to defeat the Communists, but it is the place where we may lose to communism, either with war or without a war. When we look at Formosa what do we find? Mr. President, once Formosa goes and once Korea goes it means Japan becomes untenable and all Asia goes. Once all Asia goes it means war. It may not mean war in the next 5 or 10 years, but it means war inevitably. Why? The answer has been clearly given on the floor of the Senate in the historic debate on the troops-to-Europe issue. It was pointed out time and time again that we should send aid to Europe, because once Europe falls it means eventually a war in which the odds in manpower and the odds in resources would be in favor of the other side.

I say that once Asia falls, war becomes inevitable so far as the United States is concerned, and it will be a war which we will eventually lose, because the odds in manpower and the odds in resources will be irrevocably on the other side.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Whether I agree or disagree with the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma that Asia is not the place to win the war against communism, I may say there is one place where we could have very likely won against Communist aggression in the world, and that is in the State Department of the United States Government. We might have won in the State Department of the United States Government. I will go further and say that we have been losing the struggle against communism within the State Department of the United States Government.

Mr. NIXON. Commenting directly on the point made by the Senator from Iowa, the Senator will recall that earlier when he was questioning me he made



mention of the fact that export permits for critical materials that were being shipped to the Chinese Nationalists were withheld. Such withholding of permits was in part responsible for the inability of the Chinese Nationalists to successfully ward off Communist attacks. I think the Senator is aware of the fact that the man in the Department of Commerce who was approving and disapproving export permits at that time was none other than William Remington, who now stands convicted of perjury for having lied when he said he was not a member of the Communist Party. That indicates exactly the situation we are confronted with in a Department other than the Department of State.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am aware of the fact, Mr. President.

Mr. NIXON. If I may conclude, General MacArthur's viewpoint is quite different from that of the State Department. I shall briefly state his viewpoint as I understand it. It is one which I share.

Let me say that I am not among those who believe that General MacArthur is infallible. I am not among those who think that he has not made decisions which are subject to criticism. But I do say that in this particular instance he offers an alternative policy which the American people can and will support. He offers a change from the policies which have led us almost to the brink of disaster in Asia—and that means in the world.

His program, the program which I think most of us can support, very briefly is this:

He starts with a proposition with which most of us can agree, that no war is cheap. No Senator should rise on the floor of the Senate and attempt to justify under any circumstances the loss of American men on the ground that the war is not costing us very much, that it is costing the other fellow more than it is costing us.

A natural corollary to that proposition is that if the war is not cheap, we should bring it to an end and we must bring it to an end without appeasement. We must do that because that is why we fight the war. If we were to have appeasement, we should not have started to fight in the first instance.

The third point is that we must bring the war to a conclusion with a military and diplomatic victory. How are we going to do it? As I understand, this is what General MacArthur suggests:

First—and I challenge anyone to suggest that this should not be done—immediately stop all trade with Communist China. That includes the \$1,000,000,000 a year which is pouring into China through the port of Hong Kong. There is no justification for this trade under any circumstances when Chinese Communists are shooting down United Nations forces in Korea; and there is no excuse for any one of the United Nations—Great Britain, the United States, France, or any other nation—sending one bit of material through any port to help the Chinese Communists.

The second point he makes is that in order to bring the war to a successful

conclusion he must have the right to bomb the bases from which the enemy is building up its forces. That means bombing across the Yalu River.

The third point he makes is that we must get every assistance we can from other nations equally interested in this common enterprise. That means from our partners in the United Nations. Some, it is true, are making a very notable contribution. I, for one, would never question the contribution made individually by a Britisher, a Frenchman, or any other man who has gone to Korea to fight and die. But this should be a united action. It is not that in fact at the present time, as we well know, because of the failure of other nations to give us the amount of assistance which they should.

Fourth—and I emphasize this point particularly because it has been mentioned on this floor time and time again, and because I think General MacArthur's position has been distorted—we should get every possible assistance from other United Nations, including the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa and including, in addition, whatever assistance we can get from guerrilla forces on the Chinese mainland.

At no time has General MacArthur indicated that he would send American men to fight on the mainland of China. At no place has he suggested that, and certainly I am not suggesting it at this time.

He says that if we do these things then there is a chance that we can bring the war to a successful military conclusion.

Mr. President, I believe that rather than follow the advice of those who would appease the Communists, who would gain a cessation of hostilities by letting the Communists have what they wanted when they started the war—and that is what we are going to do if we follow the critics of MacArthur—rather than do that, what we should do is to do what we intended to do when we went into Korea, and that is to bring the war to a successful military conclusion by taking the necessary steps in implementation of the resolution passed by the United Nations, to the effect that Communist China was an aggressor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.  
[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). If the demonstration in the galleries is repeated, the galleries will have to be cleared. The rules of the Senate are clear on this matter. Our guests may not abuse their privileges or violate the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am very much disappointed that the few remarks which I shall make must be made to empty chairs on the other side of the aisle. But evidently Senators on that side have all retired for the day.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.  
Mr. BRIDGES. I wonder if the Senator has any knowledge as to why the

chairs on the other side of the aisle are empty. Senators on that side were present in great numbers listening to the remarks of their hatchet man, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. When he finished, and when a constructive approach to this problem was made by the distinguished Senator from California and other Senators, at one time not even the majority leader, or any Senator acting for him, was on the other side of the aisle. I say that such a situation is very questionable, and I am sorry that we see such an exhibition on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] were present, because I may say something about some of the statements he made a little earlier this afternoon.

Mr. President, I think the cat is out of the bag. I am glad that the able Senator from Oklahoma made the address he delivered this afternoon, except, of course, that I regret very much that he had to vilify a great American, a great soldier, and a great general, as he vilified General MacArthur. However, I think he let the cat out of the bag when he said, in substance, that it became necessary to fire General MacArthur in order to hold our allies.

I think it may be worthwhile to discover that those running the Government of the United States do not even know that Korea is on the mainland of Asia. How silly can we get? How silly do those who are running the American Government today think the American people are? For a year, since June 1950, they have been trying to make the American people believe that the Korean war was not a war. Just how silly do they think the American people are?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.  
Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is not the Senator aware that while the administration has been telling the American people for years that it is working avidly for peace, it has been getting us deeper and deeper into war all the time? In other words, the administration has been giving us peace talk, and has been getting us into war.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is correct.

I discovered this afternoon, in listening to the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], that General MacArthur is a big, bad wolf. He is a bad man. Not only is he a bad man, but he is a bad general.

General MacArthur has been a general for 40 years. He was a general in World War I, and also in World War II. He has been a general for more than 30 years. He has been winning battles. He is a great American and a great general. Yet a United States Senator stands on this floor this afternoon and vilifies him. The Senator from Oklahoma stood here this afternoon and said—I can understand it only in this way—that a Chinese Communist is a bad Communist only when he arrives in Korea with a gun in

his hand to shoot down American soldiers. Is not that what the Senator from Oklahoma said?

Mr. GREEN. No.

Mr. CAPEHART. What did he say, if he did not say that? In substance he said, and I repeat it, that a Chinese Communist was only a bad Communist when he arrived in Korea with a gun in his hand to shoot down an American boy. That is what he said. He also said to the Chinese Communists, "You can be Communists if you want to; you can control all of China; and we are going to do nothing about it, in spite of the fact that we have been telling the American people that we must fight communism." The American people are spending money to rearm this Nation to fight communism, but the Senator from Oklahoma told the Chinese Communists we were not going to do anything about it "unless you come into Korea with guns in your hands and shoot down American soldiers."

I call the attention of the Senate and of the American people, as I did once before this afternoon in questioning the able Senator from Oklahoma, to the fact that we have had in Korea 60,000 casualties of American boys from Indiana, Ohio, California, and all the other States, American boys who have been fighting the North Koreans and fighting the Chinese Communists. Yet the President of the United States ordered the American Navy to stand between 500,000 Chinese Nationalists, Chinese citizens, on the island of Formosa, and said to them, "You dare not cross that water and go back to China and fight for your own homeland."

It is bad enough for the President not to permit those 500,000 Nationalists to fight and help the American boys in Korea, but the President denies to 500,000 citizens of another country the right to return to their own country and defend it. Why does he do that? He does not want to offend the Communists in China. He does not want to offend Russia. He does not want to offend England. He does not want to offend France. He does not want to offend any of the other members of the United Nations. Let no one say that statement is not true. It is true.

We hear much talk about our allies. Where are they? I listened to a radio dispatch today from Paris in which the statement was made that the people there were having a great celebration. They were happy, glad, that General MacArthur had been fired. What a wonderful thing that was. Now Europe will be defended and protected. Yet what is our situation in Korea? We have lost 60,000 American boys there. What has France done about the Korean situation? What has England done about it? What have our other allies done about it?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a list of offers of military assistance to the United Nations for Korea, troops and materials and naval vessels which have been offered, and the numbers and amounts which have been received.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Status of offers of military assistance to the U. N. for Korea*

Country and offer	Status
1. Australia: Naval vessels (S/1524, S/1646). 1 RAAF squadron (S/1530). Ground forces (S/1637, S/1646).	In action. Do. Do.
2. Belgium: Air transport (S/1620). Infantry battalion (S/1787).	Do. In Korea.
3. Bolivia: 30 officers (S/1618).	Acceptance deferred.
4. Canada: 3 naval vessels (S/1602). 1 RCAF squadron (S/1617). Ground forces (S/1700). Canadian-Pacific Airlines (commercial facilities) (S/1685). 10,000-ton dry-cargo vessels.	In action. Do. Arrived Korea. In action. Do.
5. China: 3 infantry divisions and 20 C-47's (S/1562).	Acceptance deferred.
6. Colombia: 1 frigate. 1,080 ground forces.	En route. Accepted.
7. Costa Rica: Sea and air bases. Volunteers (S/1645).	Do. Acceptance deferred. Accepted.
8. Cuba: 1 infantry company.	Accepted.
9. Denmark: Hospital ship <i>Jutlandic</i> (S/1699). Motor ship <i>Pella Dan</i> .	En route. Withdrawn.
10. El Salvador: Volunteers, if United States will train and equip (S/1692).	Acceptance deferred.
11. Ethiopia: 1,069 ground forces.	Accepted.
12. France: 1 patrol gun boat (S/1611). Infantry battalion (S/1760).	Withdrawn. In action.
13. Greece: 7 RHAFA Dakota transport aircraft (S/1612). Ground forces (S/1755).	Do. Do.
14. India: Field ambulance unit (S/1647).	Do.
15. Luxembourg: Infantry company (60 men).	In Korea.
16. Netherlands: 1 destroyer (S/1670). 1 infantry battalion (S/1775).	In action. Do.
17. New Zealand: 2 frigates (S/1563). Combat unit (S/1636).	Do. Do. Do.
18. Norway: Merchant ship tonnage (S/1576).	Do.
19. Panama: Contingent volunteers; bases for training. Use of merchant marine. Free use of highways (S/1673). Farm hands to supply troops.	Acceptance deferred. Accepted. Do. Pending.
20. Philippines: 17 Sherman tanks. 1 tank destroyer (S/1561). Regimental combat team (S/1681).	In Korea. Do. In action.
21. Sweden: Field hospital unit (S/1615).	Do.
22. Thailand: 1 infantry combat team (S/1622). 2 corvettes and navy transport.	Do. In action (1 corvette destroyed after grounding).
23. Turkey: 1 infantry combat force (S/1630).	In action.
24. Union of South Africa: 1 fighter squadron (S/1669).	Do.
25. United Kingdom: Naval forces (S/1515). Ground forces (S/1638, S/1702). Air unit.	Do. Do. Do.

Prepared in the Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, what are we going to do? I asked the able Senator from Oklahoma this afternoon how it is proposed to win the Korean war, and he could not tell us. He said he was not an expert. He said he did not know. He did not know, so he said, what the Joint Chiefs of Staff had on their

minds. But he opened his speech by saying that MacArthur was not fired because of a controversy between the President and MacArthur, or between Dean Acheson and MacArthur, but because of a controversy between the Chiefs of Staff and MacArthur. I challenged him and asked him to prove that statement. I challenge him to prove it tomorrow when the Senate reconvenes. I challenge him to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement telling the American people wherein lay the difference between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur. I do not think he can do so. He let the cat out of the bag. It is our allies who demanded that General MacArthur be fired. They said to the President of the United States, "We will not join with you in fighting a Chinese Communist so long as the Chinese Communist is on Chinese soil." But it is perfectly all right for him to walk across an imaginary line with a gun in his hand, shoot down an American boy, run back across that line, and once he gets back across that imaginary line the American boy is denied the right to follow him and kill him.

What kind of business is that? How silly can a people become? How silly can a leadership be? How is it possible for a Nation to have a leadership that has maneuvered itself and our country into the position in which we find ourselves? How is that leadership going to win the Korean war?

I placed in the RECORD this afternoon an editorial from the Washington Daily News, and I shall read a portion of it, or perhaps all of it, as it states the situation much better than I can. The heading is: "What now, Mr. President?"

Meaning the President of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, that you have fired General MacArthur—

What next?

You have appointed General Ridgway as his successor to all United States and United Nations Far East commands.

Yet, 2 days ago, General Ridgway said:

"I see no end to the military operations unless there is a political settlement. I have no personal knowledge of negotiations for a political settlement. . . . There is nothing transitory, nothing temporary, about this situation we are in so far as a fight against communism is concerned. For Communist leaders this is a life-and-death struggle. The Communists will not vary their objectives. These fellows are out to destroy us no matter how long it takes."

Those were the words of General Ridgway, who was appointed to succeed General MacArthur. I say to the Senate that General MacArthur has never said anything worse than the words uttered by General Ridgway.

The editorial continues:

Isn't that the same thing that General MacArthur has been saying?

By firing General MacArthur, Mr. President, have you come any closer to winning or ending the war in Korea?

That, eventually, is the test you must meet.

Serving General MacArthur's head up on a platter may temporarily appease the yapping yahoos of the British Socialist Government. But Britain has only 13,000 ground troops in Korea.



It may bring a frenzied delight to Prime Minister Nehru of India. But India has sent only an ambulance unit and some gunny sacks to Korea.

It may give some satisfaction to the French, but they have only 600 men in Korea.

Listen closely to this:

Yet, when word goes to the 250,000 Americans alive and fighting in Korea? What is to be done in retribution for the 60,000 American casualties, including the 9,000 American dead—what assurance that their bleeding and dying shall not have been in vain?

General MacArthur has been sacked because, it is said, he was insubordinate.

General MacArthur's crime is that he saw no sense in fighting a losing or a futile war.

Mr. President, I ask those who may be listening to me or those who may read what I am saying, as it will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: What would any one of them have done had he been commander in chief of the United States forces in Korea, and been such for nearly a year, and been obliged day after day to hear of American boys being killed, crippled, and taken prisoner, knowing that the United Nations would not permit him to fight except in a little area they themselves laid down? Indiana is about the size of Korea. The geographical situation would be about the same as that in which the United Nations Army is fighting in Korea if there were such an army in the State of Indiana from Indianapolis to the southern border of the State, and an enemy force beyond Indianapolis. If the southern army were told, "When you get to a point near Indianapolis, you cannot go any farther," how do Senators expect a war with an enemy to the north would be won, and what would they do if they were in command in such circumstances? Would they not cry out for more troops? Would they not cry out to the 52 members of the United Nations—who have done very, very little, and some of whom have done nothing—"Please send us more men and more materials." In such a contingency, would not Senators appeal to their own nation to send more materials, and would they not call to the attention of their own government the situation in which they found themselves?

This afternoon the able Senator from Oklahoma has said that we are not going to fight Red China. He said we could not defeat them. Mr. President, I remind the Senator that we are fighting Red China. We have in Korea 250,000 men who tonight are face to face with a Chinese Communist army. Why do Senators make statements that we are not going to fight the Chinese Reds, when we are fighting them now. I suspect that since I have been standing here, some Chinese Red has killed an American boy. The American people are becoming sick and tired of this double talk. They are becoming sick and tired of having their leadership in Washington say they are not going to fight the Red Chinese, when they are fighting them. The American people are becoming sick and tired of having their leadership in Washington say it is not a war, when we have lost 60,000 men in

Korea. What sort of business is this, Mr. President?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With regard to what the Senator said a moment ago, when he spoke, by way of illustration, of an imaginary war in southern Indiana, and of a refusal to permit the troops to go into northern Indiana, I wonder whether the Senator would go further and comment as to whether under such circumstances he would think Indiana was not a part of the continental United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, as I said a little earlier, the situation is ridiculous. What could be sillier, Mr. President, than for anyone to say that Korea is not a part of the mainland?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It was the statement by the Senator from Oklahoma that Korea is not a part of the mainland of Asia that prompted me to make my inquiry of the Senator from Indiana in regard to the situation in Indiana under those circumstances.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand.

Mr. President, I read further from the editorial:

General MacArthur's crime is that he saw no sense in fighting a losing or a futile war.

He insisted that we get this war over—by victory, as has been the American habit.

To do the job, he asked for reinforcements—from all members of the United Nations—and a free hand to mount the maximum counteroffensive against the enemy. He asked that the 500,000 troops of Nationalist China be permitted to fight on our side.

He asked for these things because he wanted to win the war so that our troops could come home.

Mr. President, I ask those who listen to me, How can anyone put himself in the ridiculous position of saying that our forces in Korea do not want the 500,000 troops of Nationalist China to fight on our side, that those 500,000 Chinese Nationalist troops are no good, and would be a handicap—in other words, 500,000 Chinese citizens who wish to return to their own country, to defend their own country and to take it away from the Communists? How can anyone with any capacity to reason be opposed to permitting those troops to cross to the mainland, except on the basis of appeasement, and on the basis that our allies, members of the United Nations, are opposed to it?

I read further from the editorial:

Secretary of State Acheson and the British Socialists and Nehru have won a great victory. They have got General MacArthur's scalp—which has been their goal for many months.

But now that the diplomats and the politicians have taken over this war, what are they going to do with it?

The President's order relieving General MacArthur of his command authorized him to issue such travel orders as he wishes to go

any place he sees fit. But that does not apply to the 250,000 American troops under his command. They are left in Korea.

What is to be done about these men?

What about Korea?

What about the rest of Asia?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In connection with what the Senator from Indiana has been saying, I wish to ask him whether he has seen a late news release on the ticker.

Mr. CAPEHART. No, I have not seen it.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I shall read it, if the Senator will permit:

Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party, said in a statement that General MacArthur's removal was long overdue, that the people should demand that it be the first step in swiftly negotiating an end to the Korean war, returning our boys, making peace in the Far East, and recreating the United Nations in the spirit of the United Nations Charter, by inclusion of People's China.

In other words, that means recognition of Red China.

Does not the Senator from Indiana feel that the Senator from Oklahoma has associated himself very clearly with that statement by Eugene Dennis, the statement the Communists are shouting from the housetops all over the world today, namely, that the removal of General MacArthur is a victory for Red communism?

Mr. CAPEHART. There can be no question about it. The able Senator from Oklahoma said this afternoon, on the floor of the Senate, that we do not intend to fight the Communists in China; in other words, they are good Communists, so long as they stay in China; they are great fellows, according to the able Senator from Oklahoma, so long as they remain in China; but, I repeat, the minute they step across an imaginary line with guns in their hands to shoot down American boys, then those Chinese Communists are bad. Otherwise, according to that viewpoint, they are perfectly good; and if one of them can run across that imaginary line and can shoot down an American boy, and then can get back on the other side of that imaginary line, General MacArthur and his boys dare not chase them and dare not shoot them. Mr. President, how could anything be sillier?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana who got us into the war in Korea?

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course it was due to the foreign policy of Truman, Marshall, and Acheson.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly it was not due to General MacArthur, was it?

Mr. CAPEHART. Certainly not.

Mr. WHERRY. It was Mr. Acheson's cooperation with the policy of President Truman that got us into the war in Korea, was it not?

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course; and now they are trying to scalp General MacArthur and make him the scapegoat.

Mr. WHERRY. And the next step will be, will it not, the recognition of Red China, which is what Acheson wanted all along?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Then Red China, as a member of the United Nations, will side with the other Communist nations that are members of the United Nations, will it not?

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, that is correct.

Mr. President, in the minds of our leadership there seem to be two kinds of Communists, bad Communists and good Communists. In other words, this afternoon the able Senator from Oklahoma said, "We are going to meet Communist aggression and Communists wherever we find them," but in the next breath he said, "Never will we touch the Communists on the mainland of China"—in other words, that we will oppose them only when they run across an imaginary line with guns in their hands.

Mr. President, the American people will not be fooled any longer.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is the distinguished Senator from Indiana referring to the "agrarian Communists" whom General Marshall and the State Department discovered in Communist China, which led to the instructions to General Marshall to force Chiang Kai-shek to recognize and deal with the Communists in China?

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, yes; there is no question that that was done. There is no secret about it. The able Senator from Nevada knows it, and all the others of us know about it.

Mr. MALONE. They are the "agrarian Communists," are they?

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course. Those who are responsible for our present foreign policy would build up the Communists with one hand, and they say they want to tear them down with the other hand, contending that they do not believe in them. Yet when a general such as Douglas MacArthur, who does believe in destroying communism, is in command, they fire him.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I repeat, these are the agrarian Communists, are they not?

Mr. CAPEHART. They are called agrarian Communists. So far as I am concerned, there is no such thing as a good Communist; they are all bad.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator expect Secretary Acheson to turn his back upon them?

Mr. CAPEHART. No, I do not. I repeat, I do not.

Mr. President, I say again that the cat is out of the bag. Now the great hue and cry, and the great argument which is being heard all over the United States, is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had to get rid of MacArthur because—I do not

know because of what, but they just had to get rid of him. I think I know the reason, if they had anything at all to do with it, and earlier I challenged the able Senator from Oklahoma to place it in the RECORD tomorrow. But now the story and the propaganda are going forth. People will read it. They will listen to it on the radio. It will be said, "We had to get rid of MacArthur because MacArthur was precipitating a war against China." Think of that. That is what the able Senator from Oklahoma said. That is what people are going to hear on the radio tonight. They are going to read it in the newspapers. It will be said, "We had to get rid of MacArthur because if we did not we were going to have a war." Think of that.

How silly, Mr. President, do they think the American people are? The war in Korea has been going on for almost a year. We have had 60,000 casualties. We have 250,000 soldiers now in Korea. We are taxing the American people to death. We are spending \$4,000,000,000 or more a month for materials alone. Yet the hue and cry is already being made. The State Department placed in the hands of the able Senator from Oklahoma a great speech. We could see the earmarks all through the speech.

I repeat, people will hear on the radio tonight, they will see on television, and they will read, "Ah, that bad man, General MacArthur. What a bad fellow. Ah, that terrible man. He wants to get the United States into a war." Think of that. How can those responsible for such statements be so foolish. Can they possibly be so foolish as to think the American people are going to believe them?

We are in a war. How are we going to get out of it, except we win it on the battlefield—unless we win it by appeasement? I asked the able Senator from Oklahoma that question, but the State Department possibly had forgotten to write the answer to it in the Senator's speech. How are we going to get out of it?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the able Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether the official version put out by the administration is not that this is not a war in Korea, but merely a police action?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is what they say, that it is a police action.

Mr. KEM. Is it not true that under the Constitution a war must be declared by the Congress? And is it not true that Congress has never declared a state of war in Korea?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Congress has not done so, but it ought to.

Mr. KEM. So officially, notwithstanding frequent references in the discussion here to the existing war, it is merely a police action. Is that what it is called?

Mr. CAPEHART. So far as I am concerned, it is a war, and I think that the

25,000 boys who are in Korea consider it to be a war. I think the parents and sweethearts of the men who are there consider it to be a war. Of course, the able Senator from Missouri knows it is a war; but he knows, of course, as I do, that, for some reason or other, the leadership of the Nation does not want to call it a war.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Indiana feel that his intelligence is being imposed upon when he is told that it is merely a police action?

Mr. CAPEHART. It is an insult to the intelligence of anyone. Our intelligence is now being further insulted by those who tell us that General MacArthur was fired for fear that he would get us into a war.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Indiana has pointed out that he does not think Dean Acheson will turn his back on the Chinese Communists. Does the Senator think it would require any great stretch of the imagination to conceive that, within the next few weeks, or within the next few months, the administration may send to the Congress a request for a great Marshall plan for the purpose of rehabilitating Red China?

Mr. CAPEHART. We can expect anything. When the leadership will stand up and say that Korea is not a part of the mainland and not within Asia, and that the present debacle in Korea is not war, then I may say to the able Senator from Delaware, we may expect anything. But that is the hue and cry.

The cat is out of the bag. MacArthur, the big, bad wolf, is about ready to start a war. Think of that. So the administration had to get rid of him before he started a war. That is what the able Senator from Oklahoma said. The hue and cry is, "We must get rid of him."

Furthermore, even if he does not start a war, it is said he is no good anyway. That is about what was said in substance.

Of course, the fact is that we have lost our sovereignty. The fact is that we have not been running the Korean war. Great Britain and India have been running it. There is no question that they served warning on the United States, "You get rid of MacArthur, or we will part company with you." There is no question that they served warning, "If you set foot on the mainland of China, if you kill a single Chinese Communist, count us out. We will not even keep in Korea the 6,000 troops we have there now"—few as they are.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. How much faith can be placed in such countries when we send American troops to Europe? If this is to be the performance on the



part of those countries in the Orient, at a time when we are now furnishing five-sixths of the soldiers on the battlefield, how many soldiers are they going to place on a Western European front, if the occasion arises?

Mr. CAPEHART. I was about to ask that question, myself. What is to happen to General Eisenhower in Europe? Is he going to be treated in the same way? If war breaks out in the Western European area, are we to furnish 90 percent of the manpower? Will they tell us how to conduct such a war? Will they say to us, "You may fight in a given area only"? Will they say to General Eisenhower, "Some day, we may have to get rid of you, too, because you might start a war"?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In World War II we furnished two-thirds of the troops on the western front, did we not?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is a correct statement of the ratio, according to my understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator surmise that the countries in Europe are now jubilant because MacArthur is out, and the Korean campaign has been defeated by them? Cannot the Senator imagine that they are saying, "Ah, we are now going to have our front in Western Europe defended"? What does the Senator think of that?

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely repeat what I have already said, the cat is out of the bag. The administration leaders tried to get rid of MacArthur before he started a war in China. That is the hue and cry. I repeat it. I have done so several times, and I want to do it again. Listen to the radio tonight, read the newspapers, view the television programs—the hue and cry will be, "We had to fire MacArthur because if we hadn't, he would have started a war, he would have gotten us into a war with China." Think of that. Just how silly does the leadership of our Government think the American people are?

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. KEM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not know what kind of war anyone might be accused of trying to start, in connection with the episode which we have all been discussing today, but regardless of what may have been started elsewhere, I think it may be truthfully said that, to those who like such wars, a very satisfying war of words was started here on the floor of the Senate today. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has his views on what happened, which he will state at the proper time. He thinks, however, that out of the debate which has taken place thus far today, there may go out to the people of the country, and particularly to our one-quarter million men in Korea, a very false idea as to the reaction on the part of Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, not regarding the replacement of General MacArthur, but regarding the selection of the two great soldiers

who have been named by the President to carry for us and for our Nation and for all free nations very heavy responsibilities in Korea and in Japan.

I have talked, I think, with not less than 30 Members of the Senate today, on both sides of the aisle, and while I have found them of varying points of view as to the significance of what has happened and as to the justification or lack of justification for what has happened, I have not found a single Senator but who knows that the action in relieving General MacArthur of his very high command—four high commands—was taken in the American way. There has been no subterfuge; there has been no departure from law; there has been no inclination to question the fact that the democratic method prescribed by our Constitution has been followed, and there has been acquiescence in what has been done, at least to the extent of recognizing it as having been done in the lawful way and in the American way.

Let us forget for the moment the question of wisdom or unwisdom in that part of the action. Let us forget for the moment the question of what the action of today may mean insofar as our foreign policy in Asia may be concerned. For myself, I hope that out of this action there will come quite speedily a needed clarification of our foreign policy in Asia. But I wish to spend the few minutes I expect to take of the time of the Senate in discussing the very great wisdom of the two appointments which were made today, from the standpoint of assigning real Americans and great soldiers to handle responsibilities which are of transcendent importance to every person in this Nation and to all free peoples throughout the world.

There have already been some complimentary words regarding General Ridgway. I wish to reiterate every word of compliment and every word of congratulation to that great soldier upon the wonderful record he has made in that newest branch of our services, the Airborne Infantry, having great knowledge, as he does, of that most flexible method of operation which grew out of the second world war. He made a grand record in that war. He has made a splendid record since the war, before he went to Korea. He has made a superb record as a great American and as a great commander not only of Americans, but of a truly international army in Korea, since he went there as the commander of the land forces in Korea.

I think there is one thing we should do before we leave this Chamber today, remembering that in Korea and in Japan dawn is about to break upon the first full day since this cataclysmic change has been made. I think we should here make known our unbounded confidence in General Ridgway, in his character, in his ability to speak for a completely united America, as he takes over responsibilities which are not solely military responsibilities, but which are very grave from the international and diplomatic standpoint. They are responsibilities in which he follows another great commander who has proven himself to be a great organizer and a great diplomat in the 5 years in which

he has been about the business of firmly reestablishing Japan.

Mr. President, the people in the Far East—and there are about 100,000,000 in Japan and in the areas which are close by—attach a tremendous importance to prestige and to what they call "face." I hope that there will come from both sides of the aisle expressions of unbounded confidence in General Ridgway and in his ability to lead and to take the place of the leadership in which General MacArthur has made a very, very fine record in the rehabilitation of Japan.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment.

I believe there is a duty upon us to express that sort of feeling on behalf of all Americans everywhere with reference to the man who, without having desired it, takes that heavy responsibility upon his shoulders and upon his great loyal American heart today—a responsibility which is of incalculable importance to all the world.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I rise to join the Senator from Florida in his expressions of confidence in General Ridgway. I know of no Senator who lacks confidence in General Ridgway. Certainly I join with the Senator from Florida in expressing the utmost confidence in the great patriotism and unusual ability of the general. I am happy to do that. But I say to the Senator from Florida that I think there will be great concern in the minds of the American people as to whether General Ridgway may not suffer the same fate General MacArthur suffered at the hands of the political manipulators who are fixing the foreign policy of this country, if he dares to demonstrate the great ability he has, and express his great judgment in the conduct of the war in Korea, and if he fails to make himself subservient to the diplomatic and political managers who are attempting to operate the great military movement in Korea. I think there will be a fear in the minds of the American people that General Ridgway's ability, his Americanism, his patriotism, and his sterling qualities, which I happily acknowledge with the Senator from Florida, will suffer the same treatment which has been visited upon the great General MacArthur.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the expression of the Senator from Iowa. I think of nothing the Senate could do which would tend more to give General Ridgway the opportunity to serve to the utmost of his ability and capacity than for him and the world to know that the Senate, meaning all Senators from all States, of all hues of political philosophy, look to him with confidence to carry the heavy load which he assumes today.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to state that I share the views of the Senator from Florida as to the capacity of General Ridgway as a general in the field. I wonder whether the Senator from Florida knows of any dispute at any time, either on strategy or policy, between

General Ridgway and General MacArthur.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know of none.

Mr. FERGUSON. So far as I know, they have been in complete agreement, both as to strategy and policy. Is that not a fact?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would say to the Senator that certainly the Senator from Florida has no knowledge of anything short of complete agreement between General Ridgway and his former commander, General MacArthur. My words of praise for and my confidence in General Ridgway are in no sense a reflection upon General MacArthur, and they in no way lessen my compliment, congratulation, and praise for the fine service which he so frequently rendered, but I prefer at this time to confine myself to those aspects of the matter which have to do with the ability of the two great commanders who were named today to meet the heavy responsibilities that rest on their shoulders. I have already referred to General Ridgway, and I desire now to refer to General Van Fleet.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to recall the fact that when the Senator from Florida previously spoke about General Van Fleet I joined him in his statement because I had met the general in Athens, and knew something of his work there, and of his capacity as a general. I share the views of the Senator. I do not know whether he is familiar with what is related in the Washington News, which is a Scripps-Howard paper. It is the reason why I asked the Senator whether he knew of any dispute between General MacArthur and General Ridgway. The News quotes him as saying:

I see no end to the military operations unless there is a political settlement. I have no personal knowledge of negotiations for a political settlement. . . . There is nothing transitory, nothing temporary, about this situation we are in so far as a fight against communism is concerned. For Communist leaders this is a life-and-death struggle. The Communists will not vary their objectives. These fellows are out to destroy us no matter how long it takes.

The question asked by the editorial was: "Isn't that what General MacArthur has been saying?"

I ask the Senator from Florida whether or not he is familiar with the quotation I have read, indicating that the two generals were in complete agreement on both strategy and policy in Korea?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say that I saw the quotation which the Senator has read. My own opinion has been that General Ridgway has been very busy with fighting ever since he got to Korea. I have seen him quoted very infrequently. I have never heard him referred to as a party man. I have never heard him referred to as having taken any partisan or political position in American politics. I am glad that that is the case. I hope we can keep him entirely clear from any question of politics. It is a very difficult position with which we are confronted. We must decide what our policy will be in the Asiatic field. Before the Senator came to the floor the Senator from Florida, while stating he did not propose to discuss the situation in general, had also stated that he felt a speeding of a

needed decision on the matter would result from the affair of last night which would make available to our people more facts upon which a quick, happy, and wise decision could be made. I am trying to divorce entirely the job that General Ridgway now finds himself confronted with from any question of politics. I am trying to give to Senators on the other side of the aisle an opportunity to join me, as two of them have already generously done, in an expression of our high confidence in General Ridgway and General Van Fleet. I am trying to send these two men to their exalted positions of trust with the knowledge that the people of America are backing them, and with any prestige which will flow to them out of that fact. They are in an area of the world where prestige is of incalculable importance, as the Senator knows. I appreciate what the Senator has said in complimenting General Ridgway and General Van Fleet. If the Senator will permit me to go ahead I shall be glad to yield later.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield so that I may add my voice to a bipartisan expression? I hope we are only considering one question, and that is the security of the United States and the peace of the whole world.

Mr. HOLLAND. I join the Senator in the expression of that hope and prayer. I happen to know that the casualty lists have already touched very closely the lives and hearts of some Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I happen to know that no Member of the Senate or House does not have full knowledge of the fact that there has been terrible sacrifice and terrible suffering. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, with all the shouting that has been going on here today, he has been much more deeply concerned with his knowledge of the fact that approximately 250,000 American boys are entering into a new day in Korea at about this time, with a new commander now flying across the wastes of the Pacific to report for duty in commanding them within a very few hours. I think that anything we can do to hold up his hand, to hold up their stout hearts, and to strengthen them in their feeling that the whole American Nation, no matter that we may debate questions of foreign policy, as we shall no doubt debate them for the next few weeks, are standing back of them as one man and are standing back of the leadership which has been assigned in the American way to lead them, as they meet their individual and collective responsibilities, which are as heavy as any that have ever fallen upon young Americans.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I wanted to say a word about General Van Fleet, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I wish to join with Senators who have expressed their appreciation for the spirit of the words uttered by the Senator from Florida. In that connection, I should like to say that I think the swift way in which General Ridgway endeared himself to and won the confidence of his command and put

new spirit into the forces of which he was in direct charge has had a salutary effect upon the American people as a whole. Whatever may be said on the floor of the Senate with respect to the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the removal of General MacArthur, the world should know that there is no division in the minds of the American people with respect to their support of their new commander in the Far East and their confidence in General Ridgway and General Van Fleet.

I wonder if at this time the Senator from Florida would yield so that I may ask unanimous consent to place in the Record, either at this point or at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks, the complete interview with General Ridgway with respect to the course of the war in Korea.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to have it inserted in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HOLLAND. With reference to General Van Fleet, in a sense I apologize to the Senate for again mentioning him, because I think every Senator knows that I happen to be a life-long friend of General Van Fleet. We were barefoot boys together. We fished and hunted and played baseball together. I have always had a keen personal interest and pride in the fine services he has rendered to the Nation. My purpose in rising at this time, however, to mention him briefly has no relation to the personal aspects of the question. It relates, instead, to my feeling that the Senate should usher him into his new responsibility, which he accepts as a good soldier and for which he did not ask, because his services have been performed on the other side of the water, with an expression of what we feel in our hearts about him and about the confidence, which I know, from having talked to Senators today, we all have in his ability, loyalty, patriotism, and capacity as a great leader of men on the field of battle.

Lieutenant General Van Fleet graduated from West Point. He went through World War I, in which he was wounded. He was the commander of one of our two units on D-day in the landing on the Normandy coast, where he received two more wounds. He stayed with his command until after the capture of Cherbourg. He commanded the Ninetieth Division in the capture of that hardest of all nuts, the big fort just west of Metz, about which we read so much only a short time ago. He was promoted to be a corps commander, and was flown in to command the Third Corps at the time of the capture of the Remagen bridgehead, because his ability for swift and effective action had already been so well established.

He commanded that great corps in enveloping the Ruhr and accepting the surrender of some three hundred thousand Germans there, performing a miraculous feat of arms, which is so recognized by skilled soldiers everywhere. Then, detached from Courtney Hodges' Army and attached to Patton's command, he became commander of a wing



of Patton's army and swept across Germany into Czechoslovakia, where he was at the end of the war.

I think all of us recall his notable services recently in Greece. Going there as a diplomat and as a soldier, he acquitted himself wonderfully as the head of our military mission to Greece. That mission, the action of the Congress, the leadership of the President, and the combined cooperative action of the American people as a whole have all paid off tremendously in connection with the effort in Greece, in which he played such a large part. There was a similar effort in Turkey.

I do not need to tell Members of the Senate, because they already know it, that Turkey and Greece have stood by us. Their men are fighting alongside ours in Korea. They will be fighting in Korea at daylight, just as our own boys will be fighting there. General Van Fleet has intimate acquaintance, knowledge, and connection with the great job which has been done over there heretofore as one part of our American policy, which has proved successful.

More recently he has been commander of the Second Army, with headquarters at Fort Meade, in charge of defending that large area of the Nation extending from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, in the middle part of our country. Among other things, he was charged with the duty of defending the Capital of the Nation. He is a great military commander. Even now he is winging his way to Korea, and to the unknown fate which awaits him and his leadership there.

Mr. President, I think we would be exceedingly remiss if we did not express, where all can hear it, our supreme and abiding confidence in the qualities of leadership of General Van Fleet as a man and as a soldier. We feel toward him just as we feel toward General Ridgway. They are going to need all the support, all the infusion of confidence and strength which the Senate, divided on other issues, has no hesitancy in expressing, I am sure, as a unit, toward both of those great Americans and great soldiers.

Mr. KEM rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. HOLLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon. I was about to conclude.

I hope that from this session today, in which there has been much debate that was far from gentle, much debate that even bordered upon the acrimonious, the Nation and the world will get the clear impression that that debate rests simply upon the question of what shall be our policy, and not upon the question of whether we believe implicitly in the fine qualities of leadership possessed by Generals Ridgway and Van Fleet, who have upon them the heavy responsibility of the defense of the American Nation and of civilization at the two remote outposts where they are reporting for duty today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

END NOT IN SIGHT IN KOREA—RIDGWAY—ONLY POLITICAL SETTLEMENT CAN HALT WAR, FIELD COMMANDER BELIEVES

(By Rutherford M. Poats)

EIGHTH ARMY FORWARD HEADQUARTERS, KOREA.—Lt. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway said yesterday that only a political settlement can end the Korean war.

The commander of United Nations ground forces said no end to the Korean war is in sight unless such a settlement is reached.

"I have no personal knowledge of negotiations for a political settlement," he told a press conference at his forward headquarters.

Ridgway warned the Allies to abandon the idea of an end to the war against communism.

"There is nothing transitory, nothing temporary about the Communist determination to destroy us completely," he said. "This for the Communist leaders is an all-out life or death struggle. They have not varied their objectives. They may vary their tactics, timing strategy—yes—but their objectives never."

Ridgway said the Eighth Army still holds the initiative in the Korean war and intends to keep the pressure on the Communists.

He conceded that if the Communist wants to exercise his advantages by virtue of his superior numbers and his complete disregard for human life, he may make a penetration.

"But it doesn't give me any concern whatever. I am quite sure that everybody in the Eighth Army believes that if he gets a penetration we will check it and destroy it."

Ridgway said the next major move in Korea was up to the Communists, but declared he would continue to fight a war of maneuver.

"I am not going to take a defensive position, except temporarily. To stand and fight is inviting destruction."

Ridgway gave a realistic appraisal of the strength of Chinese and North Korean forces including the possibility of strong surprise air operations.

He said the Eighth Army's strength was increasing, not in new organizational units, but in a gratifying flow of replacements filling infantry regiments to their highest effective level of the war.

He said the Eighth Army now has more artillery than ever before.

Ridgway said "the Chinese Communists were well grouped for offensive action down the Chorwon-Seoul axis, the Kumhwa-Seoul axis or the central Chunchon-Wonju route."

#### NEVER TAKEN DEFENSE

In estimating the enemy's next move he said, "we don't know whether it's going to be delayed—his form of defense—or attack. So far as I know he has never taken a defense position, meaning to stay there."

Ridgway said there had been increasing reports the Communists were planning to use air power. He cited their efforts to construct air fields in North Korea and prisoner claims that the Reds were waiting for armor, artillery and air before launching an offensive.

Ridgway said the Chinese withdrawals in the last several weeks probably were an attempt to get out of reach of allied fire power so they could reft, replace and regroup.

#### DOWN WEST COAST

He said the main pattern of vehicles and train traffic for resupply has been down the west coast. The east coast highway traffic has been cut to a trickle by naval surface shelling and Navy and Air Force planes.

He said the Eighth Army's engineering efforts has been the biggest single factor in the success of the Allied drive north.

"We think our intelligence is good and getting better every day," he said. "There is a steady improvement in the timeliness and accuracy of our intelligence."

SHIPMENTS OF WAR MATERIALS BY MARSHALL-PLAN COUNTRIES TO RUSSIA AND RED CHINA

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think General Ridgway and General Van Fleet can be assured that the United States Senate will support them in every way possible in the important responsibilities which they are undertaking.

There is one aspect of the discussion this afternoon which I think perhaps has not had the emphasis it should have. I refer to the fact that large amounts of war materials and items useful for war are now being delivered by our allies—that is, by countries which are beneficiaries under the Marshall plan—to Russia, to her satellites, and to Communist China.

On March 9, 1951, I wrote to the President of the United States, inviting his attention to the fact that several Marshall-plan countries are making large shipments of war material and items useful for war to Russia, her satellites and to Red China. I have to date received no reply.

This problem has been the subject of editorial comment throughout the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to attach as a portion of my remarks an article written by the well known columnist, George Rothwell Brown, and published in the Albany, N. Y., Times-Union, on March 27, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON.—There's a widespread opinion that President Truman gets "trigger happy" whenever he finds himself in front of a typewriter, and that he just can't resist the urge to dash off a crisp note, whether to a marine or a music critic.

But when the subject of uninvited correspondence is distasteful, the President, so to speak, can take it or let it alone.

With American casualties in Korea approaching 60,000, the failure of the Truman-Acheson government to enforce the law prohibiting financial or economic assistance to foreign countries trading with Communist Russia or Red China, reveals that this is one of the things Mr. Truman doesn't like to write letters about.

Embarrassment is understandable, since it appears to be clear that the President is ignoring and disregarding the statute enacted by Congress on September 27, 1950, to cut off Marshall-plan money to countries making shipments of war-useful materials to Russia or her satellites.

Thus it appears that for more than 6 months of unconscionable neglect the administration has refused to enforce an act of Congress, enacted to safeguard the national security, and to prevent, among other things, war-useful materials from being used by Russia's Chinese Communist allies against American soldiers in Korea.

This notwithstanding the fact that the constitutional oath of office taken by President Truman specifically pledges him to see to it that the laws of the land are diligently enforced by him.

The prohibitory statute, designed to keep American war materials from falling into Communist hands, was enacted as an amendment (section 1304) to Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress.

President Truman at the time strenuously objected to this provision, but Congress adopted it notwithstanding.

On March 9, 1951, Senator JAMES P. KEM, of Missouri, coauthor of the amendment, sent a letter to Mr. Truman, by messenger, addressed to him as Chairman of the National Security Council, calling the President's attention to the fact that this law is apparently regarded as a dead letter. He wrote:

"Since this law went into effect, it has been repeatedly disclosed that several Marshall-plan countries are making large shipments of war-useful items to Russia and to Red China. British trade with Red China has been particularly active through her crown colony, Hong Kong, in such items as rubber and copper."

KEM bluntly calls on the President to enforce the law.

As this is written, President Truman has not acknowledged Senator KEM's letter.

This is regarded at the Capitol as an unusual act of discourtesy by the President toward a United States Senator.

It is especially significant since Senator KEM is the senior Senator from the President's own State, Missouri.

#### GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, concluding with a quotation of the letter addressed by General MacArthur to Representative MARTIN, of Massachusetts, on March 20, 1951, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT OF SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

This is an hour for calmness and good judgment.

I definitely support the proposal to have General MacArthur immediately speak before a joint session of the Congress on the crucial foreign policy issue.

If that cannot be arranged, it is my view that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously should invite General MacArthur to report to us in open or executive session giving us his views on the background of the President's action and infinitely more important, what MacArthur proposes that we now do in the global struggle against communism. I believe that it is inescapably the duty and obligation of the Foreign Relations Committee possibly in conjunction with the Armed Services Committee to hear from MacArthur's lips at first hand his judgment.

We owe that to MacArthur not only because of his unsurpassed record as a patriot and military leader and as the executive genius who almost single-handedly has administered 83,000,000 Japanese, but even more important, we owe it to ourselves as a Nation.

While America demands justice for Douglas MacArthur, it recognizes as he does that the decision on the foreign policy issue rather than the fate of an individual as such is the really crucial element.

The action of President Truman can become one of the most critical single turning points in the history of America and in world affairs. The repercussions are staggering and are so vast, so broad, that none of us today can even sense their nature in the months and years to come. In troubled Japan, where he has become the idol of the Japanese people, the whole course of American policy will be affected.

One thing is certain, and that is that Red Russia will capitalize on the present grave crisis and will use it to her own advantage in both a military, economic, and propa-

ganda sense. We must try to minimize Russia's exploitation of this issue to the greatest extent possible. We must weigh every single action and every single word we do and say at this time in the light of whether it helps or hurts in the world-wide struggle against communism.

Speaking as senior Senator from Wisconsin, I know that I express the deep shock and profound regret of the people of our State over the President's action.

[FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF APRIL 5, 1951]

#### LETTER TO REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN OF MASSACHUSETTS

MARCH 20, 1951.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARTIN: I am most grateful for your note of the 8th forwarding me a copy of your address of February 12. The letter I have read with much interest, and find that with the passage of years you have certainly lost none of your old-time punch.

My views and recommendations with respect to the situation created by Red China's entry into war against us in Korea have been submitted to Washington in most complete detail. Generally these views are well known and clearly understood, as they follow the conventional pattern of meeting force with maximum counterforce as we have never failed to do in the past. Your view with respect to the utilization of the Chinese forces on Formosa is in conflict with neither logic nor this tradition.

It seems strangely difficult for some to realize that here in Asia is where the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that we have joined the issue thus raised on the battlefield; that here we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight it with words; that if we lose the war to communism in Asia the fall of Europe is inevitable, win it and Europe most probably would avoid war and yet preserve freedom. As you point out, we must win. There is no substitute for victory.

With renewed thanks and expressions of most cordial regard, I am,

Faithfully yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

#### CIVIL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in common with a great many other Members of the United States Senate, I wish the record to show how thoroughly alarmed I am at a recent action of the House Committee on Appropriations in connection with the appropriation for civil defense.

That committee has reported a bill to cover the third supplemental appropriations for 1951, which passed the House yesterday. A part of that bill contains the first appropriations for civil defense in our country. The Civil Defense Administration requested \$403,000,000. Against this the House committee recommended an appropriation of \$186,750,000. Of this amount, \$100,000,000 is set aside for use in time of emergency, leaving only \$86,750,000 available to get the program under way.

I am sure that most of us here remember the careful hearings and exhaustive debate held on this legislation within the past 3 months. At that time all of us who took part in the debate agreed that it was a far-reaching bill but was necessitated by the urgencies facing the world and our country today. These urgencies are even greater at the present moment than they were at the time we passed this law. Un-

fortunately, the sense of urgency seems to have been lost by some because of the temporary successes of our fighting in Korea. The reasons for passing this bill had nothing to do with conditions in Korea. It was designed to protect American lives and American productive capacity during attacks on our continent. Every day that goes by increases the number of atomic weapons in the possession of the Russians which can be used against us. Every day that goes by gives them an opportunity to improve the means whereby those weapons could be delivered. The time we have to get ready to meet this attack is entirely too short. Yet our colleagues in the House approach this problem as an abstract, hypothetical one to be solved through budgetary procedures. It is unfortunate that they do not control the expenditures of the Russians who are preparing to use these weapons against us.

We cannot blindly ignore the danger that is upon us. I am thankful that in the United States Senate we have recognized this problem and are prepared realistically to face it. All the billions we spend on national defense could be wasted if our civil defense is neglected. Our military effort can only be as strong as the sustained and continuing production of our country. That is the problem of civil defense. If the House action is any criterion, the military effort could be starved and completely defeated because of our failure to be properly prepared on the home front.

This program is not merely one of buckets of sand and stirrup pumps. It is the creation of a second branch of our defense structure. The one is the military, the other the civilian. It is under the administration of a very capable man, Millard F. Caldwell, of Florida. It means the training of millions of volunteer workers; the accumulation of adequate stockpiles of food and medical supplies to supply likely target areas; the equipping of mobile fire-fighting units to meet the requirements of an atomic bomb burst; it means the research to develop proper shelters, and ways and means of combatting the terrible after effects of not only atomic weapons but the effects that might come from bacteriological warfare. In fact, Mr. President, it means the complete mobilization of the minute men and women of our country into a defensive force which will absorb terrific casualties and spring back into a full productive routine.

I cannot but feel sorrow and concern for those in the States and cities who have been working so vigorously on this problem and now find that the national leadership has been curtailed. I think, however, that they can take hope from the fact that there is still a final review of this problem. That review is by the United States Senate and its Appropriations Committee. I urge strongly that the members of that committee consider this problem against the background of world affairs as they know them, restore the House cuts, and insist on their amendments when they go to conference. I, for one, and I am sure I will be supported by many others, will never agree to the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee.



## THE PRESIDENT VERSUS MACARTHUR

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada questions the authority of the President of the United States to fire the United Nations commander in chief, General MacArthur. The question is "Does the United Nations Organization have real authority?"

The muddle the administration has got us into with its entangling alliances, with its turning over of our American troops, and obviously our officers, to the United Nations command, now poses an important question.

This sell-out by those in our Government who love and want to protect the Chinese Communists is exactly what I predicted long ago. The socialistic Communist lovers and appeasers in the State Department are in the saddle, and God help us.

The President sent our troops into Korea on June 26 in advance of the request to the United Nations, and then requested the approval of the United Nations, which was secured. The President has since refused to move without the United Nations sanction, saying that the whole matter is in the hands of the United Nations. Since the United Nations approved the appointment of General MacArthur as commander in chief of the United Nations forces, the question now is: Can the President remove General MacArthur as the commander in chief of the United Nations forces without authority from the United Nations?

Mr. President, the hour is late, and the junior Senator from Nevada intends to extend his remarks tomorrow afternoon on the Senate floor.

REPLACEMENT OF GEN. DOUGLAS  
MACARTHUR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to supplement the very fine statement made by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] relative to the support and backing the Senate, and the House no doubt, will give to General Ridgway and also to General Van Fleet. I do not believe that by the furthest stretch of the imagination language such as that contained in the concurrent resolution I submitted could bring up any such issue as the Senator mentioned. Certainly I endorse the splendid record of the two generals. I should like to say specifically that, as I am quite sure the distinguished Senator from Florida will recall, at the time General Van Fleet was made a lieutenant general, I joined in confirming his nomination, and agreed with the Senator in the forceful remarks he made at that time with reference to General Van Fleet.

It was my experience to be with him 2 days and a couple of nights in Western Germany at the time of the surrender the distinguished Senator mentioned. I rode with him in a jeep for miles and miles. I came to know him in that brief acquaintance, and afterwards I visited with him. I think he is an outstanding general. I have every confidence in the ability and judgment of General Van Fleet.

While I do not know General Ridgway personally, as the distinguished Senator

from Florida does, I am sure the Senate would generally join in approving the things the Senator from Florida said about him.

Certainly the question of loyalty and confidence, as it has been so ably expressed by the Senator from Florida, is not involved in the concurrent resolution, which asks that the two Houses on both sides of the aisle, join in inviting General MacArthur, now that he has been removed, to return to the United States and address both Houses, and, if Members so desire, to appear before committees of the Congress. I shall be glad to modify the concurrent resolution along that line. Certainly all the aid and advice we can secure from distinguished persons such as General MacArthur and others will be helpful to us in arriving at the proper division of the defense dollars and in determining a national defense policy we all want to see established in view of the situations which now confront us.

Mr. President, several Senators have come to me today about the concurrent resolution. One or two Senators do not agree with respect to one or two words or phrases in the "whereases." The "whereases" are not important. I am not sure there ought to be "whereases" in a concurrent resolution. An identical concurrent resolution was submitted in the House. I submitted the concurrent resolution in the Senate in behalf of those who felt it ought to be submitted.

Mr. President, since the concurrent resolution has not been acted upon, I shall ask that a change be made in it. The word "session" is used in it. That should be changed to "meeting." I did not intend that the word "session" should be used, and so stated when the resolution was drafted, but said the word "meeting" should be used. As amended, the clause will read:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That General of the Army Douglas MacArthur be invited to present his views and recommendations for policies and courses in Korea and Asia generally to a joint meeting—*

The word "meeting" should be used instead of "session"—

of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution was thought out and based upon precedents. In order to satisfy one or two Senators who came to me and objected to a joint meeting because there was no precedent for it, I refer the Senate to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6203, part 5, volume 91. The majority leader at that time, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], said this:

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the House of Representatives has invited the Senate to join them today to do honor to General Eisenhower, and that they want us to be on the floor of the House at quarter after 12, I ask Senators to wait until we return from the House before presenting matters in which they are interested, so that we may proceed immediately to the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

I skip three or four paragraphs:

(The proceedings of the House of Representatives and the address delivered by Gen-

eral Eisenhower at the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress appear beginning on p. 6243 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

At this point in the RECORD I offer as exhibit A the speech of General Eisenhower. I call attention to the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on which it can be found. It is to be found in the RECORD of June 18, 1945, beginning in the middle column on page 6243, continuing through the remainder of that page, on all of page 6244, and ending in the second line, the middle column of page 6245. It is a very able speech. The recommendations and observations General MacArthur would be asked to make will no doubt parallel those made by General Eisenhower in his speech before Congress. So here we have a precedent upon which the concurrent resolution is based for a joint meeting of the Senate and the House, at which General MacArthur might be invited to give an address to Congress, the representatives of the people in which he may submit his recommendations and observations and suggested policies for the Near East, or the Pacific, or anywhere around the world if he wishes to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, the concurrent resolution previously submitted by the Senator from Nebraska will be modified in accordance with the request he has just made.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) as modified, is as follows:

Whereas the action of the President in summarily relieving General of the Army Douglas MacArthur of his commands as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief, United Nations Command; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East, has precipitated a situation fraught with danger to the national defense and has struck a blow to the national unity that is so vital in these perilous times; and

Whereas General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has had a long and distinguished career in the Pacific in the service of our country, and possesses unsurpassed knowledge of political and military conditions in Korea and Asia generally that would be helpful to the Congress in determining a sound national defense policy for the unified support of all Americans: Therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That General of the Army Douglas MacArthur be hereby invited to present his views and recommendations for policies and courses in Korea and Asia generally to a joint meeting of the Senate and House of Representatives.*

SEC. 2. This invitation shall be extended forthwith to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in a jointly signed communication, and that the majority and minority floor leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives make the arrangements necessary for the convening of such a joint session to be held at the convenience of General of the Army MacArthur.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also wish to state that I have asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. FERGUSON) to join me in sponsoring the resolution. I have consulted him, and he has consented to do so. I now ask that his name be added as a sponsor of the resolution.

I may say that the distinguished Senator from Michigan also has submitted a concurrent resolution, although it is somewhat different from mine. He believes that his concurrent resolution is broader than mine; but he is in accord with the purposes of my concurrent resolution. In view of the fact that he has submitted a concurrent resolution on the same subject, I have asked him to join me in sponsoring my concurrent resolution. Therefore, I ask that his name be added as a sponsor of my concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

Let the Chair inquire whether it is the intention of the Senator from Nebraska to have the speech of General Eisenhower, to which the Senator from Nebraska has referred, printed in today's RECORD. The Senator has referred to that speech as an exhibit to his speech.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have it marked "Exhibit A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator merely wishes to refer to it, but not have it inserted in today's RECORD?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. I have referred to that speech because it is my belief that those who read today's RECORD will wish to read General Eisenhower's observation as to the situation existing in Europe at that particular time. It is on that basis that in the concurrent resolution it is proposed that there be given to General MacArthur a similar invitation to return to the United States and address a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress, so that he might have an opportunity—as I said earlier today, at the beginning of today's session—"to have his day in court." It is my judgment that if we met in that way with General MacArthur, many of the questions which have been raised and many of the general observations which were made today by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]—and I am satisfied that we have to read between the lines of his speech—would either be completely forgotten or would be answered by General MacArthur in making his recommendations at such a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. In that event, the observations made today by the Senator from Oklahoma, or any similar observations which might hereafter be made by any other Senator, would be answered by General MacArthur. Certainly the best way to learn about what General MacArthur has done or what he thinks should be done is to hear from General MacArthur himself.

I am satisfied that the American people would be glad to join in such an invitation; and I cannot see any reason why the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], would not join with me, as minority leader, in asking that such a meeting occur. I do not wish to press the majority leader to join me in the request at this time, for I know he has had a long day, and was very busy last night, after a long and tiring day, however, I wish to ask him to consider whether he will join

us in asking that General MacArthur be invited to return to the United States and speak to the two Houses of Congress at a joint meeting. For the majority leader to join in that request would demonstrate unity and great leadership on his part in carrying out the purposes I have in mind in extending to General MacArthur the invitation referred to. I hope the concurrent resolution will be speedily adopted. The appearance of General MacArthur would give the two Houses of Congress the benefit of his counsel and advice in regard to the policies relative to the far eastern situation, and whatever observations he might care to make.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words to what the very noble and distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said in regard to General Ridgway and General Van Fleet.

Personally, I had the privilege of serving under General Van Fleet for a very few days in the great section of France near Metz. I do not claim to have any expertness as a military man, but I do have a very high regard for that fine general.

I also had the pleasure of meeting General Ridgway—in San Juan, as I recall—for a very few minutes. It would take only a few minutes for that great general to sell himself, I think, to any good, red-blooded American. It is very fine, I think, that we can have such great confidence in those two officers, who have been placed in positions of high command in Korea.

Now I wish to say to the great and distinguished minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that on the floor I know he is always offering to cooperate. He demonstrates a fine spirit of cooperation at all times.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly endeavor to do so.

Mr. FREAR. I also know that the great majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], is of the same red blood that the Senator from Nebraska is; and I believe the majority leader will cooperate with the minority leader in every proper way.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure that will occur, and that will be wonderful.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in what has been said about General Ridgway. General Ridgway is a great soldier. He has turned reverses into victory; he has already proved his worth, for he has been on the ground and has really been in command in the field.

As to General Van Fleet, I shall not now attempt to add to what has been said here about him. He, too, is an officer of high ability; and I am sure that he, too, will do a great job. I am confident both General Ridgway and General Van Fleet will render a very fine account of themselves.

Mr. President, I agree with those who say that the removal of General MacArthur should not be made a political issue. In a time of crisis, the necessary changing of commanders in a vital military mission is most unfortunate; but international unity at such a time far outweighs sympathetic consideration for

any great general. No one can deny that the allied world was falling apart over the confusion due to conflicting statements coming from Korea. The United States has become the greatest and the freest nation on earth because it was founded on the principle of government by and for the people. Civilians, not the military, must be the source of final authority; otherwise we would have fallen under military dictatorship long ago. When military officers attempt to make nonmilitary decisions, outside their authority, a grave danger to our form of government immediately arises.

Gen. George McClellan was removed from his command of the Union Army during the Civil War because of his refusal to carry out the orders of President Lincoln. When an American general takes steps which high military leaders believe might plunge us into a third world war, alienate our allies, involve us in endless struggles throughout Asia, and precipitate a global conflict for which we are not prepared, the Commander in Chief has no choice but to remove him.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement which has been sent to me by one of the distinguished Members of the Senate, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who is necessarily absent. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in full at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCKELLAR

Our Constitution provides, "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

The President states in his order three cases of disobedience by General MacArthur to the President's orders as Commander in Chief. To date there has been no denial of the President's statements. Under these circumstances I do not see how the President, as Commander in Chief of this Nation, could have taken any other course. I regret more than I can say that this situation has arisen. I have known General MacArthur for probably 30 years. He is a fine, upstanding military officer, and has accomplished much for our country. I admire and respect him. General MacArthur simply made a mistake in not working with the head of the team at a crucial time.

As I recall from history, our own President Polk, of Tennessee, had similar trouble with Gen. Winfield Scott in the late 1840's and took a similar course. General Scott came home and ran for President and was defeated.

#### RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of March 26), 1951:

#### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.



All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be lieutenant colonel*

George Edward Adams, O19412.  
Robert Hawkins Adams, O19474.  
Hal Peter Andersen, O39920.  
John Hicks Anderson, O19398.  
Herbert Hadley Andrae, O19546.  
Charles Leon Andrews, O19363.  
Robert Carl Bahr, O19470.  
James Oscar Baker, O19396.  
Robert Gardner Baker, O19427.  
John George Benner, O19571.  
Austin Wortham Betts, O19373.  
Severin Richard Beyma, O19399.  
Theodore Gilmore Bilbo, Jr., O19477.  
Guy Miller Blencoe, O30245.  
Marzelle Freeman Boyd, O39921.  
Harold Conly Brookhart, O19562.  
Charles Edward Brown, O19552.  
Percival Stanley Brown, O19487.  
Staunton Lindsley Brown, O19356.  
Travis Tabor Brown, O19574.  
Harold Webb Browning, O19545.  
Burton Blodgett Bruce, O19360.  
John Page Buehler, O19374.  
William Beehler Bunker, O19402.  
Clark Graham Campbell, O38774.  
Frank Joseph Caulfield, O19515.  
Miles Birkett Chatfield, O19404.  
Daniel Murray Cheston 3d, O19507.  
Fredric Carson Cook, O19484.  
William Hutcheson Craig, O19526.  
Kenneth Alonzo Cunin, O19481.  
William Alexander Cunningham 3d, O19579.  
John Walker Darrach, Jr., O19473.  
Harold Charles Davall, O19425.  
Ellis Oakes Davis, O19387.  
Kermit LeVelle Davis, O19386.  
Merlin Louis DeGuire, O19446.  
Meade Julian Dugas, O19582.  
Donald Linscott Durfee, O19538.  
George Lowe Eatman, O19548.  
Henry William Ebel, O19434.  
Hallett Daniel Edson, O19541.  
Charles Bernadou Elliott, Jr., O19490.  
Robert Erlenkotter, O19354.  
Charles Francis Fell, O19368.  
Lloyd Elmer Fellenz, O19485.  
Robert Henry Fillmore, O30254.  
Robert Griffith Finkenaur, O19441.  
John Walter Finn, O30257.  
Thomas Clary Foote, O19488.  
Howard Gregory Ford, O38775.  
James Eugene Foster, O30256.  
John Francis Franklin, Jr., O19476.  
William Howard Garrett Fuller, O19190.  
George Horner Gerhart, O19569.  
Gerald King Gifford, O51539.  
Seymour Irving Gilman, O19377.  
Stacy William Gooch, O19455.  
Karl Trueheart Gould, O19544.  
James Grady Hattox, O30253.  
Thomas Hogan Hayes, O19556.  
Percy Thomas Hennigar, O19450.  
Henry Richardson Hester, O19419.  
Daniel Henry Heyne, O19493.  
Edwin Gantt Hickman, O19575.  
Charles Wadsworth Hill, O19430.  
Harry Lester Hillyard, O19524.  
William Joslin Himes, O19365.  
Theodore Frelinghuysen Hoffman, O19403.  
Claude Morris Howard, O19464.  
Harry Jenkins Hubbard, O19459.  
Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390.  
Russell Walker Jenna, O19564.  
Charles Edward Johnson, O19534.  
Dana Watterson Johnston, Jr., O19506.  
Claude Patrick Joyce, Jr., O42426.  
Franklin Kemble, Jr., O19418.  
Kenneth Riffel Kenerick, O19452.  
William Bentley Kern, O19566.  
Joseph Ochenschlager Killian, O19370.  
Peter James Kopcsak, O19440.  
Gersen Leo Kushner, O19420.  
Robert Carson Kyser, O19535.  
Harry Evans Lardin, O19494.  
John Dixon Lawlor, O19536.  
Emory Alexander Lewis, O19584.  
Thomas Heber Lipscomb, O19371.

XCVII—231

Clark Lynn, Jr., O19456.  
Robert George MacDonnell, O19361.  
Almon White Manlove, O19413.  
Ronald LeVerne Martin, O19428.  
Thomas Andrew McCrary, O19570.  
Thomas Barney McGary, O51540.  
Richard Lee McKee, O19453.  
Ralph Doak McKinney, O19529.  
Robert Hector McKinnon, O19590.  
Donald Glover McLennan, O19475.  
Dennis John McMahon, O19592.  
Donald Adams McPherson, O19555.  
Lee Carl Miller, O19438.  
Robert Beauchamp Miller, O19366.  
Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444.  
Richard Ringo Moorman, O19394.  
Albert Patterson Mossman, O19469.  
William Joseph Mullen, Jr., O19586.  
Herbert Henry Naughton, O51536.  
Henry Neilson, O19588.  
William Frederick Northam, O19547.  
Frank Carter Norvell, O19471.  
John O'Connell, O42422.  
James O'Hara, O19593.  
Thomas Almon O'Neill, O19583.  
Peter Samuel Peca, O19392.  
William Scott Penn, Jr., O19442.  
Travis Dudwell Petty, O19439.  
Joseph Sylvester Piram, O19411.  
Mathew Valois Pothier, O19410.  
John Valteau Rathbone, Jr., O42424.  
Charles Rea Revie, O19369.  
James Harry Reynolds, O39919.  
John Buchanan Richardson, Jr., O19596.  
Thomas DeForth Rogers, O19351.  
David Belmont Routh, O19437.  
Edwin Rusteberg, O19542.  
Horace Lake Sanders, O19445.  
William Ferdinand Schmidt, O42423.  
Jonathan Owen Seaman, O19385.  
Leo William Henry Shaughnessy, O19458.  
Clifford Guildin Simenson, O19511.  
Page Harrison Slaughter, O30250.  
Stillson Hilton Smith, Jr., O19480.  
John Farnsworth Smoller, O19416.  
Craig Smyser, O19417.  
James William Snee, O19516.  
Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479.  
John Berchman Stanley, O19549.  
John Fredrick Stein, O51538.  
John DuVal Stevens, O19414.  
Marion George Stewart, Jr., O30244.  
Daniel Edward Still, O19510.  
Alexander James Stuart, Jr., O19447.  
Joe Free Surratt, O19461.  
Charles Francis Tank, O19350.  
Ferdinand Julian Tate, O19359.  
Robert Nabors Tyson, O19594.  
Donald Oliver Vars, O19432.  
Wilford Edward Harry Voehl, O19382.  
Russell William Volckmann, O19537.  
James Edward Walsh, O19372.  
Louis Alfred Walsh, Jr., O19567.  
Nathaniel Plummer Ward 3d, O19553.  
Gordon Graham Warner, O19466.  
Robert Butler Warren, O19380.  
William Hammond Waugh, Jr., O19587.  
Richard Edward Weber, Jr., O19421.  
James Buchanan Wells, O19554.  
Charles Henry White, Jr., O19407.  
Urquhart Pullen Williams, O19391.  
James Dudley Wilmeth, O19519.  
Donald Clark Wilson, O30248.  
James Richard Winn, O19491.  
Yale Harold Wolfe, O19415.  
Carl Delbert Womack, O19426.  
Charles Herbert Wood, O19498.  
Thomas Eugene Wood, O19483.  
Donald Edgar Yanka, O30252.  
Samuel Knox Yarbrough, Jr., O19460.

*To be majors*

Sterling Henry Abernathy, O32401.  
Robert Abraham, O32427.  
Ned Evans Ackner, O32452.  
Vernon Tommims Adler, O32635.  
Louis John Aebischer, O32384.  
Joe Ahee, O22215.  
Arthur Wright Allen, Jr., O22034.  
Hugh Arthur Allen, Jr., O32622.  
Raymond Walter Allen, Jr., O21810.  
John Edwin Arthur, O32468.

Bernard Edward Babcock, O44018.  
Roger Martin Bachman, O22226.  
Harry Balish, O22218.  
Howard Dayle Balliett, O22684.  
John Campbell Bane, O21897.  
Paul Alonzo Bane, Jr., O32596.  
Homer Griswold Barber, O22130.  
George Schaeffer Bare, O32488.  
Walter Emil Barker, O22717.  
Tom Walker Barnett, O44164.  
William Holloman Barnett, O22104.  
Robert Burns Barry, Jr., O22674.  
George Anton Barten, O32605.  
John Sewanee Baskin, O22634.  
Henry Elmer Bates, O32644.  
Alexander Batlin, O43927.  
John William Baum, O38997.  
Robert Fairfax Bayard, O44169.  
William Frederick Beaty, O22672.  
Lawrence LeRoy Beckedorff, O21781.  
Alexander Becker, O32392.  
William Hugh Bedford, Jr., O43926.  
John Craig Beechley, O44115.  
Glenn Taylor Beelman, O22235.  
Donald Chessman Beere, O21893.  
Benjamin Thomas Behnken, Jr., O44052.  
Raymond Joseph Belardi, O22009.  
James Gordon Bennett, O40400.  
Clarence Riley Bess, O22060.  
William John Besser, O44039.  
James Sykes Billups, Jr., O21932.  
James Franklin Bishop, O22231.  
Delbert Leonard Bjork, O32399.  
John Keith Boles, Jr., O22025.  
Elba Walter Bowen, O32634.  
Richard Turner Bowie, O21921.  
Beryl Leon Boyce, O32400.  
Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891.  
Vincent Laurence Boylan, O22162.  
William Joseph Boyle, O21953.  
James Cannon Bradford, O32519.  
Francis Xavier Bradley, O22740.  
William Thomas Bradley, O21768.  
Myron Laithwaite Brewer, O32495.  
Maurice Raymond Brice, O32557.  
Walter Evans Brinker, O21776.  
Matt Combes Cavendish Eristol, Jr., O22077.  
Ernest Frederick Brockman, O22147.  
Robert Lewis Brooks, Jr., O44054.  
Bevelle Taliaferro Brown, O32469.  
Virgil Glenn Brown, O40398.  
Harvey Seymour Browne 3d, O38992.  
Albert Ray Brownfield, Jr., O21905.  
Page Hudson Brownfield, O40395.  
William Edward Brubaker, Jr., O32497.  
Thomas Ripley Bruce, Jr., O32423.  
Walter Reeve Bruyere 3d, O22644.  
Francis Keagle Buck, O32545.  
Thomas Buckley, O52429.  
Carl August Buechner, Jr., O22155.  
Bill Buerkle, O52399.  
Frank McPherson Bullard, O44121.  
Ralph Dallas Burns, O32472.  
John Dalton Byrne, O21837.  
George Denton Callaway, O32502.  
Robert Hyde Camp, O21798.  
Guy Luckett Campbell, O32616.  
Jim Alva Campbell, O52417.  
Chester Emmett Canine, O43949.  
C. Craig Cannon, O39008.  
Linden Kinder Cannon, Jr., O32509.  
Charles Cantrell, O22682.  
James Lewis Cantrell, O21758.  
Leo Gunnard Carlson, O22446.  
James Barclay Carvey, O22095.  
George Clancy Cassidy, O32658.  
Robert Francis Cassidy, O21783.  
Christopher Worth Chaney, O32496.  
Benjamin Charles Chapla, O22170.  
Warren Chester Chapman, O21939.  
Laurence Edmund Chloupek, O44094.  
Robert Richard Christofk, O22212.  
John James Christy, O44023.  
Alfred Knute Clark, O32608.  
Carl Vinning Clark, O40393.  
Richard deForest Cleverly, O21862.  
Paul Tucker Clifford, O22135.  
Casper Clough, Jr., O21979.  
Charles Elting Coates, Jr., O21746.  
James Max Cochran, O21945.

- Joseph Irving Coffey, O21904.  
 Norman Ewing Cole, O32484.  
 Robert Moorhouse Coleman, O22008.  
 James Lawton Collins, Jr., C21788.  
 Kenneth Wilson Collins, O22169.  
 Charles Conn, O32550.  
 Haskett Lynch Conner, Jr., O21855.  
 Donald William Coons, O22642.  
 Howard Vincent Cooperider, O22035.  
 Lewis Lee Copley, O22652.  
 Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721.  
 Byron Escar Cowart, O52415.  
 Amel Lavaine Cox, O43971.  
 Landon Greaud Cox, O32413.  
 Christopher Charles Coyne, O21879.  
 Riel Stanton Crandall, O21767.  
 Harold Mortimer Crawford, O21840.  
 Thomas Mull Crawford, O21983.  
 William Fleetwood Crocker, O32410.  
 Leslie Hector Cross, O22232.  
 Raymond Stuart Crossman, O32583.  
 Edward McCleave Dannemiller, O21822.  
 Morris Dantzker, O43992.  
 Herbert Harry Daubert, O32593.  
 Phillip Buford Davidson, Jr., O21969.  
 Donald Martin Davis, O52410.  
 John Neary Davis, O22070.  
 Thomas Walker Davis 3d, O22059.  
 Michael Shannon Davidson, O22051.  
 Jay Phelps Dawley, O21750.  
 George Preston Dawson, Jr., O38998.  
 Eugene Allen Dees, O22641.  
 Victor Eli Delnor, O32398.  
 LaMar Arthur DeSpain, O32587.  
 Leland Swarts Devore, Jr., O32404.  
 George Carpenter Dewey, O22191.  
 John Osburn Dickerson, O22071.  
 Charles Herman Dickey 3d, O44001.  
 Donald Dean Dickson, O32531.  
 Carroll William Dietz, O21836.  
 Robert Mitchell Dill, O32626.  
 David Samuel Dillard, O22175.  
 Clyde Milton Dillender, Jr., O32671.  
 Frank Girard Di Meo, O44074.  
 John William Dobson, O21851.  
 Minot Boyd Dodson, O32660.  
 Walter Charles Dolle, O21813.  
 Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980.  
 William Robert Donaldson, O22198.  
 Jack Victor Doriot, O52386.  
 Murray Dean Dougan, O22221.  
 Stephen Wheeler Downey, Jr., O22649.  
 George Kenneth Doyle, O44000.  
 Clarence William Drye, O52413.  
 George Harold Duckworth, O32621.  
 Franklin Edward Duda, O52407.  
 James Robert Duffy, O52428.  
 Charles Marsden Duke, O21753.  
 Robert Terrell Dunn, O32612.  
 Chester Howard Dunning, O52421.  
 Andrew Reid Duvall, Jr., O32444.  
 Stanley Walter Dziuban, O21738.  
 Roderick Dermott Eason, O52420.  
 Royce Lester Eaves, O32499.  
 Robert Nelson Eddy, O22730.  
 Charles William Eiffer, O32614.  
 Herbert Edward Eitt, O32477.  
 Michael Phillip Filcano, O44142.  
 Lloyd Wayne Engelland, O32551.  
 Herbert Bell Erb, O40379.  
 John Leonard Erickson, O32434.  
 Belmont Stuart Evans, Jr., O21811.  
 Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791.  
 Clarence Getty Fairchild, O40396.  
 Herman Merrill Farmer, O44158.  
 Norman Farrell, O21759.  
 James Henry Farren, O32670.  
 Stephen Charles Farris, O22022.  
 Walter Calvin Featherston, O44075.  
 Norman Edwin Fisher, O32435.  
 David Dobley Fleming, O32042.  
 Charles Wesley Florance, Jr., O22119.  
 William Merle Fndren, O32481.  
 Elwyn James Fonk, O44015.  
 Frank Goodwin Forrest, O22101.  
 Ralph Longwell Foster, O22669.  
 James Edward Foxx, O40418.  
 John Cecil Fralish, O32668.  
 Selby McKay Frank, O32620.  
 Harvey Reed Fraser, O21747.  
 Ross Putnam Frasher, O40401.  
 Charles George Fredericks, O22092.  
 Harlan Moore Freeman, O32409.  
 Arthur Lionel Friedman, O32474.  
 Albert William Frink, O22192.  
 Harold Wayne Gaines, O32559.  
 William Overton Gall, O22664.  
 Edward John Gallagher, O21775.  
 James Dee Gallagher, O43958.  
 Glendale Draper Gallaher, O43925.  
 Edward Millar Geary, O21887.  
 William Cross Gee, O44027.  
 Albert Joseph Genetti, O22194.  
 William Clark George, O21913.  
 Charles Martin Gettys, O44181.  
 Nat Giambelluca, O44161.  
 Ulrich Georg Gibbons, O21874.  
 Vernon Gustavus Gilbert, O21850.  
 Malcolm Frank Gilchrist, Jr., O22077.  
 Earl Franklin Giles, O56899.  
 Ned Woods Glenn, O22107.  
 Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, Jr., O21739.  
 David Badger Goodwin, O21914.  
 Donald Byron Gordon, O32573.  
 John William Gorn, O22200.  
 Raymond Bernard Graeves, Jr., O32563.  
 Franklin Halsted Graham, O40420.  
 Walter Herbert Grant, O22093.  
 Francis Myron Gray, O44007.  
 Gerald Woodrow Gray, O44130.  
 Norman Gray, O40387.  
 James Deimel Green, O22182.  
 William Rutledge Greer, Jr., O32651.  
 Charles James Hackett, O21954.  
 Cleo Vernon Hadley, O44036.  
 Robert Penn Haffa, O21809.  
 Clem Garrison Halley, O40409.  
 Ralph Norman Hale, O43968.  
 William Herbert Hale, O22184.  
 DeWitt Nalley Hall, O22083.  
 Richard Edward Hall, Jr., O32330.  
 James Baker Hallums, O32564.  
 Louis Francis Hamele, O32610.  
 Wilbur Ainsworth Hamilton, O52352.  
 Ralph John Hanchin, O21895.  
 Halland William Hankel, O44049.  
 Calvin Siddell Hannum, O32428.  
 Robert Lee Harlee, O44146.  
 Edmund Victor Harnstrom, O32414.  
 Armistead Robison Harper, O22738.  
 George Richard Harrison, Jr., O22152.  
 Arthur Kendall Harrold, O32417.  
 John Ellison Hart, O22742.  
 Henry Miller Hartman, Jr., O44177.  
 Frederick William Hasselback, O22673.  
 Harold Edward Hassenfelt, O22195.  
 William Henry Hastings, O22658.  
 Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737.  
 Charles Francis Heasty, Jr., O22665.  
 Mylo LeRoy Heen, O22208.  
 Peter Allard Helfert, O32385.  
 Theodore Philip Heller, O52389.  
 Oliver Jacob Helmuth, O32395.  
 William Jay Henry, O21928.  
 John Temple Heston, O52371.  
 Walter Martin Higgins, Jr., O21987.  
 Hudson Christie Hill, A32560.  
 Raymond Dunlap Hill, O22645.  
 Robert John Hill, Jr., O21933.  
 Wilbur Samuel Hilton, O32643.  
 William Albert Hinternhoff, O21844.  
 Richard Hodges, O44065.  
 Joel McCord Hollis, O22728.  
 Chester Clay Holloway, Jr., O22679.  
 Sterling Charles Holmes, O22655.  
 Frank Thomas Holt, O21908.  
 Ralph Eugene Hood, O32443.  
 Philip Lovell Hooper, O32662.  
 Lawrence Merrill Hoover, O22193.  
 Seth Foster Hudgins, O21947.  
 Donald Franklin Hull, O22067.  
 Keith Maughan Hull, O21885.  
 Theodore Norman Hunsbedt, O21883.  
 Charles Broderick Huntley, O22714.  
 Don Leigh Husman, O32431.  
 William John Alphonse Hussey, O22205.  
 William Seely Hutchinson, Jr., O32611.  
 William Judson Hyde, O44109.  
 Richard Logan Irby, O22678.  
 Fred Wilson Jacks, Jr., O32407.  
 Raymond Anthony Janowski, O21869.  
 John William Jaycox, A22078.  
 James Nelson Jean, O22632.  
 Leonard George Jewett, O22236.  
 Benjamin Washington Johnson, O52351.  
 Harold Otto Johnson, O22635.  
 John Gordon Johnson, O21929.  
 Kenneth Charles Johnson, O44090.  
 Sterling Russell Johnson, O21873.  
 James Thornton Jones, O32595.  
 Thomas Sylvester Jones, O52403.  
 Winston Anson Jones, O32602.  
 Erik William Jordahn, O44060.  
 Ralph Edward Jordan, O21911.  
 Arthur Lloyd Jorgenson, O32436.  
 Samuel Goodhue Kall, O22072.  
 William Francis Kaiser, O52233.  
 Lee S. Kaufman, O32388.  
 Frank William Keating, O38929.  
 David Simpson Keisler, O32657.  
 John William Keith, Jr., O32482.  
 James Howard Keller, O21871.  
 Kenneth Ramey Keller, O32488.  
 James Joseph Kelly, Jr., O22097.  
 John Joseph Kelly, O22185.  
 John Patrick Aidan Kelly, O22154.  
 Lem Morris Kelly, O32378.  
 Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670.  
 Victor Scott Kendall, Jr., O32521.  
 Wallace McKee Kendrick, O32615.  
 Richard Franklin Kent, O22676.  
 Charles David Kepple, O21886.  
 Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963.  
 Giles Houghton Kidd, O32659.  
 Henry Paul Killman, O32538.  
 Harry William Osborn Kinnard, Jr., O21990.  
 Paul Kinnison, O32581.  
 Richard Lee Kinson, O43955.  
 Lee Manning Kirby, O22048.  
 Edmund Kirby-Smith, O21745.  
 John Richard Koshko, Jr., O43974.  
 Charles Wilmarth Kouns, O22129.  
 Lyndon Peter Kramer, O40413.  
 Marvin Arnold Kreidberg, O22733.  
 Michael John Krisman, O21880.  
 Louis Albert Kunzig, Jr., O21741.  
 Edward Harry Kurth, O21807.  
 Josiah Scott Kurtz, O22171.  
 Russell Harold Kyckelhahn, O32467.  
 James Adams Laing, O43929.  
 Lawrence Albert Laliberte, O32558.  
 Lester Leland Lampert, Jr., O22100.  
 Sidney Winston Landes, O40397.  
 Barton George Lane, Jr., O21876.  
 Harauld Dean Langham, O32518.  
 Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094.  
 Ernest Patricio Laché, O22073.  
 Geoffrey Lavell, O22049.  
 Woodrow Laws, O30677.  
 Kenneth Earl Lay, O22224.  
 Sylvan Preston Lay, O22638.  
 Ernest Melvin Layman, Jr., O32455.  
 Frank Lester Lear, O39007.  
 Levin Lane Lee, O22172.  
 Johnson Grant Lemmon, O22653.  
 Charles David Thomas Lennhoff, O21882.  
 Carl Lentz, 2d, O21993.  
 John Winford Leonard, O44056.  
 Earle Livingstone Lerette, O22133.  
 Jack Leonard Lerner, O44103.  
 Arden Isaiah Lewis, O43360.  
 Ernst Friedrich Liebmann, O44091.  
 Roger Merrill Lilly, O21924.  
 Shelton E. Lollis, O32575.  
 Maurice Eugene Long, O40422.  
 Jack Reeson Looney, O22164.  
 John Thomas Lorenz, O52408.  
 Herbert Louis Lossen, O32420.  
 William Gerald Lucey, O44025.  
 Bernard Richard Luczak, O22196.  
 Richard Farris Ludeman, O22233.  
 Raymond Harley Lumry, O22199.  
 Walter Aloise Luszki, O44073.  
 Crawford Henry Lydle, Jr., O52349.  
 Crawford Dean Lyons, O43924.  
 Aleck Francis MacDonald, O22685.  
 Robert Alan MacGregor, O22719.  
 Robert John MacLean, O44042.  
 James Frederick MacLeod, O44026.  
 Stephen Joseph Mancuso, O22006.  
 Thomas Latta Mann, O22663.  
 Louis Mark, O32647.  
 Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899.



Herman Monroe Marlow, O32606.  
 Lon Devere Marlowe, Jr., O32459.  
 Albert Barnes Marshall, O52350.  
 John Franklin Marshall, O32648.  
 Oliver Kenneth Marshall, O22219.  
 Richard Allen Marshall, O52416.  
 Sidney Taylor Martin, O21772.  
 Ladislaus Casimir Maslowski, O21789.  
 Avery W. Masters, O22666.  
 David Mason Matheson, O21757.  
 Hallie Augustus Matlock, O40377.  
 Robert Allen Matter, O22132.  
 Matthew Charles Mautz, O22729.  
 John Boiler Maxwell 2d, O21942.  
 Stanley Getchel Maynard, O32515.  
 William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065.  
 Joseph Alexander McChristian, O21966.  
 Harry Watson McClellan, O22173.  
 Albert Edgar McCollam, O21748.  
 C. W. McConnell, O40381.  
 Edward Traywick McConnell, O21996.  
 William James McConnell, O22052.  
 Max McCord, O52355.  
 James Law McCrorey, Jr., O22158.  
 Dorsey Elwood McCrory, O22683.  
 Ralph Charles McCrum, O22643.  
 Wilnot Ruet McCutchen, O21744.  
 Carl Davis McFerrer, O21923.  
 Donald Benjamin McGrath, O32548.  
 William Joseph McIntyre, Jr., O44171.  
 John Thomas McKnight, O32439.  
 Robert Emmet McMahon, O22137.  
 Robert Parrish McQuail, O22651.  
 William Walter McWhinney, O32450.  
 Charles Langley Patrick Medinnis, O22023.  
 John William Medusky, O21756.  
 Martin George Megica, O21881.  
 Lorenzo Albino Mella, Jr., O52418.  
 Benjamin Franklin Melvin, O32585.  
 Claude Jones Merrill, O22241.  
 Harrison John Merritt, O32942.  
 Hiram Madison Merritt, O32638.  
 John Henry Meyer, O22179.  
 John Peter Mial, O22157.  
 Charles George Micheau, O32429.  
 Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992.  
 Milton Michael Miletich, O32546.  
 Clifford Lore Miller 2d, O22149.  
 Donald Busby Miller, O22018.  
 Gordon August Miller, O40386.  
 Homer Edward Miller, O22227.  
 Josiah Borden Miller, O32386.  
 Raymond Oswald Miller, O40404.  
 Francis Byron Mills, O32544.  
 Daniel Joseph Minahan, Jr., O21799.  
 John Earl Mitchell, Jr., O52328.  
 Robert Wesley Molloy, O32526.  
 Morris Bailey Montgomery, O44162.  
 James Warren Moon, O32540.  
 Louis Robert Moor, Jr., O22662.  
 Jesse Price Moorefield, O22244.  
 Timothy Augustus Moran, O32640.  
 George Leslie Morelock, Jr., O43960.  
 George Clyde Morton, O39010.  
 Charles McNeal Mount, Jr., O21849.  
 Richard Moushegian, O22109.  
 James Irvin Muir, Jr., O21802.  
 Patrick David Mulcahy, O22015.  
 Luther Wenbert Murphy, O43979.  
 Harry Lawrason Murray, Jr., O22140.  
 Harry McNeil Myers, O21835.  
 James Richard Myers, O22209.  
 David Young Nanney, O21866.  
 William Christian Neumann, Jr., O44145.  
 Fidelis David Newcomb, O22056.  
 Francis Kosier Newcomer, Jr., O21898.  
 George Pickering Nichols, O40407.  
 Daniel Andrew Nolan, Jr., O21988.  
 Jack Kummer Norris, O21865.  
 Herbert Raymond Odom, O22086.  
 Thad Sam Oliver, Jr., O32553.  
 John Eric Olson, O22125.  
 Charles Frederick Ottinger, O39012.  
 Benjamin Newhall Page, O32530.  
 Robert William Page, Jr., O22120.  
 Dean Edgar Painter, O22720.  
 Nicholas Paraska, O21765.  
 Charles John Parsons, O22183.  
 William Henderson Patterson, O22110.  
 Kenneth Gool Pavay, O22207.  
 John Joseph Pavick, O21780.  
 Willys Hicks Pearson, C22660.  
 William John Penly, O22300.  
 Robert Pennell, O22139.  
 Tony Francis Perpich, O32552.  
 Carl August Peterson, O52344.  
 Frank Joseph Petrilli, O32433.  
 John James Petto, Jr., O32380.  
 Thornton Edgar Pfaff, O32405.  
 George Edward Pickett, O21938.  
 Oscar Glazier Piland, O52360.  
 Max Le Pitney, O22721.  
 Ogene Pitts, O44126.  
 Robert Riis Ploger, O21760.  
 Arthur Dean Poinier, O21999.  
 Lemuel Edwin Pope, O22646.  
 John Irving Pray, O22214.  
 William Montgomery Preston, O22099.  
 William Herbert Price, Jr., O21903.  
 James Reid Raber, O44076.  
 Daniel William Rachal, O44159.  
 Kurt Gustav Radtke, O22203.  
 Edward Gilbert Raff, O32588.  
 Edward Elliot Rager, O22116.  
 Gerald Hamilton Ragsdale, O22217.  
 Earl Willard Ralf, O44037.  
 George Herbert Rankin, O32522.  
 Frank Gordon Ratliff, O22637.  
 Vernon Ehler Rex Rawie, O22654.  
 John Ray, O21821.  
 Arthur Wayne Reed, O21878.  
 Charles Pierce Reeves, Jr., O43996.  
 Charles William Reeves, O22223.  
 Joseph Richardson Reeves, O21820.  
 William Robison Reilly, O22163.  
 William Elliott Renaud, O44131.  
 Jack Alloyse Requarth, O22189.  
 Edwin Wendell Reynolds, O43969.  
 Joseph Everett Reynolds, O22151.  
 Edwin Thomas Rhatigan, O52412.  
 Grady Ford Riels, O44022.  
 Grover Chester Richards, Jr., O44139.  
 Ira Bertram Richards, Jr., O22639.  
 James Donald Richardson, O21761.  
 Richard Lee Richardson, O44002.  
 Jacob Kopf Rippert, O22115.  
 Richard Greene Risley, O32516.  
 LaRue Henry Ritter, O40424.  
 Edward Southward Robbins, O32636.  
 James Frederick Robert, O21920.  
 Albert Leroy Robinette, O21892.  
 Thomas Arnold Rodgers, O44010.  
 James LeRoy Rogers, O22076.  
 Urban Edward Rohr, O38996.  
 Albert Fenton Rollins, O21823.  
 James Anderson Roosa, O22138.  
 Robert James Rosa, O33078.  
 Morgan Garrott Roseborough, O22681.  
 William Ashton Ross, O39003.  
 William Clifford Rountree, O32387.  
 Charles Elmer Rousek, Jr., O44030.  
 Philip Martin Royce, O21814.  
 William Jackson Rushing, O40391.  
 Clyde Raymond Russell, O32478.  
 James Gordon Russell, O32580.  
 Howard Bertolet St. Clair, O22017.  
 Charles Pettingell Samson, O22204.  
 Edgar Seth Sanders, O52359.  
 Emil Delbert Sasse, O32421.  
 Anthony Joseph Scannon, O32393.  
 Robert Henry Schellman, O22002.  
 Carl Thomas Schooley, O22225.  
 John Robert Schrader, Jr., O21818.  
 Edgar William Schroeder, O22166.  
 Frederick Louis Schumm, O32479.  
 James Thomas Lowe Schwenk, O22106.  
 Kenneth Lansing Scott, O22121.  
 John Putnam Scroggs, O21863.  
 Philip Randall Seaver, O21916.  
 Melvin Bernard Sellers, O43981.  
 Edward MacDonald Serrem, O22090.  
 Jacob Shacter, O22724.  
 Thomas James Bartley Shanley, O21828.  
 Robert Allen Sharrer, O22229.  
 Robert Terrell Shaver, O43928.  
 Eugene Allison Shaw, O32511.  
 Claude Lee Shepard, Jr., O21931.  
 James McMenamin Shepherd, O21868.  
 Joe Rufus Shepherd, O40380.  
 Lilbourne Wayne Sherrod, O40403.  
 James Newton Shigley, O22222.  
 Samuel Ezra Shoemaker, O22661.  
 Wilbur Eugene Showalter, O21794.  
 Vester Melvin Shultz, O21974.  
 James Sexton Simmerman, O40378.  
 Lincoln A. Simon, O21961.  
 Donald Max Simpson, O21986.  
 Donald Francis Slaughter, O22202.  
 Elbert Mack Sleeker, O22716.  
 Calvin Oliver Smith, O22240.  
 Charles Bradford Smith, O22113.  
 Edward Paul Smith, O22063.  
 Everett Newman Smith, O32449.  
 Harry Thomas Smith, O22001.  
 Herald Heyman Smith, O32603.  
 Jerome Francis Smith, O40406.  
 Matthew Comerford Smith, O22038.  
 William Collyer Smith, O32572.  
 John Robert Snow, O22659.  
 Robert Beirne Spragins, O22080.  
 Hugh Gaines Stark, O40421.  
 Kenneth Blake Stark, O32633.  
 Harry Walter Stephenson, Jr., O22722.  
 Laurence Asher Stone, O40414.  
 Arthur Theron Strickland, O44085.  
 Cecil Hubbard Strong, O22725.  
 Robert William Studer, O21786.  
 Harry Wilhoit Stulting, O22726.  
 Thomas Aloysius Sullivan, O44080.  
 Charles E. Surber, O32528.  
 Clyde Terry Sutton, Jr., O22128.  
 Frank Albert Swatta, O22237.  
 William Davis Sydnor, Jr., O32618.  
 Donald Robert Tam, O43933.  
 Walter Earle Tardy, O32532.  
 Edward Walter Taylor, O32465.  
 Livingston Nelson Taylor, Jr., O21853.  
 Bernard George Teeters, O22081.  
 Joel Furman Thomson, O21867.  
 Harry Melvin Thompson, O44088.  
 Hubert Denwood Thomte, O22633.  
 William Louis Thorkeelson, O22667.  
 Eugene Albert Trahan, O21967.  
 Walter Martin Trauger, O44095.  
 Constant August Trolano, O22180.  
 David Carl Turner, O43965.  
 Bill James Tutin, O32381.  
 Paul Vernon Tuttle, Jr., O21896.  
 John Godfrey Urban, O21825.  
 William Mulford Van Harlingen, Jr., O22016.  
 Walter MacRae Vann, O21812.  
 Clifford John Van Sickle, O32505.  
 Mildridge Frazier Vaughn, O40415.  
 Lewis Dowe Vieman, O22201.  
 Louis James Wadle, O44059.  
 John Joseph Wald, O21804.  
 Joel Terry Walker, O22007.  
 John Willis Walker, O22011.  
 Marshall Wallach, O21977.  
 William Albert Walsworth, O32565.  
 Robert Lucius Walton, O22734.  
 Albert Norman Ward, Jr., O32491.  
 Raymond James Wardrop, O44698.  
 George Parker Warner, O32462.  
 Shields Warren, Jr., O22103.  
 Frank John Wasson, Jr., O39011.  
 Glen S. Waterman, O22239.  
 Patrick Boisseau Watson, O22727.  
 John Watt, O21901.  
 Montgomery Lee Webster, O21751.  
 Heinz Welsmann, O21956.  
 Glenn Arthur Welde, O40402.  
 Walter Johnson Wells, O21766.  
 Hulen Dee Wendorf, O21919.  
 Martin Stuart Wengren, O39006.  
 William Whitehead West 3d, O21922.  
 Alan Buck White, O22675.  
 Claude William White, O44029.  
 Eugene John White, O22739.  
 John Whitfield, O32537.  
 Roger Whiting, O32577.  
 John Robert Whittick, O32487.  
 Walter Charles Wickboldt, O22047.  
 Samuel David Wilder, O44104.  
 Robert William Wildey, O52353.  
 James Charles Wilkins, O44009.  
 James Wright Williams, O22736.  
 Robert Chapman Williams, Jr., O22091.  
 Robert Mabry Williams, O21801.  
 Robert Murphy Williams, O22206.  
 William Arthur Williams, O32513.  
 Jasper Jackson Wilson, O21829.

Woodrow William Wilson, O21755.  
Walter Lloyd Winegar, O2176.  
Theodore Hays Wineman, O52354.  
George Peterson Winton, Jr., O21819.  
Wiley Burge Wisdom, Jr., O21985.  
William Oscar Witherspoon, Jr., O40378.  
Carl Herbert Wohlfeil, O21907.  
Richard Duncan Wolfe, O21743.  
Paul Barclay Wolff, O32645.  
John Enos Wood, Jr., O22210.  
Oliver Ellsworth Wood, O21998.  
Walden Francis Woodward, O22190.  
Kenneth Leon Yarnall, O21864.  
Ross Young, O39001.  
Mario John Zecca, O32396.

*To be captain*

Claude Markscheffel Adams, O50251.  
James Bradshaw Adamson, O26935.  
Norman Francis Allen, O38309.  
Elmer Paul Anderson, O26869.  
Roald Max Andresen, O26567.  
Robert Early Archer, O38344.  
Raymond Joseph Astor, O50111.  
Henry Spiese Aurand, Jr., O26554.  
Roy Lindsay Baber, Jr., O27046.  
Garry Adolph Bahrach, O50188.  
Arthur Lawrence Bakewell, O50241.  
Barney Martin Barco, O38299.  
Van Thurman Barfoot, O38209.  
John Page Barker, O41273.  
Joseph Philip Barnes, O26501.  
Raymond Dalton Barrett, O50048.  
Harry Maxwell Bartlett, O39457.  
James Tuttle Bartley, O26649.  
Pierrepont Francis Bartow, O50052.  
Robert Marks Bathurst, O50120.  
Wilmer McDowell Beam, O50221.  
James Merrill Beaumont, O56012.  
Oliver George Becker, O26874.  
William Bell 3d, O26934.  
Ronayne Waldron Bennett, O56058.  
Albert Lambert Bethel, O26484.  
Richard Arthur Beyer, O38263.  
Frederick Harry Black, Jr., O26796.  
Herbert David Black, Jr., O50223.  
Charles Robert Blaha, Jr., O38245.  
George Samuel Blanchard, Jr., O26737.  
James Thomas Blandford, Jr., O26598.  
Charles Roscoe Howland Bootz, O26662.  
Wilson Norton Boyles, Jr., O26933.  
John Bernard Brady, O26794.  
Dean Michael Bressler, O26809.  
Albert Quincy Brooks, O26516.  
Dwight Marion Brooks, O50004.  
George Bellinger Brown, Jr., O26623.  
John Wesley Brown, Jr., O26751.  
Lee Roy Brown, O39459.  
Jack Brown Bruno, O26580.  
Thomas Dominick Burke, Jr., O50238.  
William Crocker Burkit, O41304.  
Roy Willis Burley, O56351.  
Henry Hastings Burnett, O26906.  
William Edward Burr 2d, O26597.  
Harry Archer Buzzett, O26683.  
Jeiks Henry Cabaniss, Jr., O26558.  
DeRosey Carroll Cabell, Jr., O26902.  
Leslie Griffin Callahan, Jr., O26704.  
Edwin Ridgley Campbell, O38306.  
Hubert Sidney Campbell, Jr., O50154.  
James Boniface Campbell, O26690.  
Jerry George Capka, O26573.  
Robert Horace Cardinell, O56158.  
John Wisdom Carley, O26571.  
John Henry Carlson, O26479.  
Joseph Green Carraway, Jr., O50012.  
Doniphan Carter, O26907.  
Jack Andrew Carter, Jr., O38302.  
Randolph Jefferson Cary, O26905.  
Lawrence Frank Clishe, O26741.  
Charles Robert Clark, O39443.  
Charles Donald Clements, O50118.  
John Gould Cleveland, O26559.  
Duncan Dixon Clore, O26642.  
James Everett Coberly, O41275.  
Robert Bruce Codling, O26498.  
Joseph Phillip Coe, Jr., O50217.  
Morgan Baxter Coker, O39451.  
Bernard Hartley Coleman, O38243.  
Robert Warren Conant, O26502.  
Warren Sanderson Conlon, O26702.

James Maguire Connell, O26700.  
Thomas Worthington Connolly, O56008.  
Francis Allyn Cooch 3d, O26712.  
Vincent Francis Coogan, O50104.  
Norman Maltby Coons, O56078.  
Kenneth Banks Cooper, O26476.  
Robert Mitchell Cowherd, O26932.  
Robert James Crawford, O38315.  
Buckner Miller Creel 3d, O39447.  
George Dunlap Crosby, O56157.  
Floyd Whitney Crouch, Jr., O56355.  
Robert William Crowley, O50171.  
Robert Gene Culbertson, O50108.  
Russell Rooks Curington, O56170.  
John Holloway Cushman, O26483.  
Joseph Frederick Hughes Cutrona, O26655.  
Robert Allen Cuzick, O36311.  
Clarence Wilfred Cyr, O26753.  
Robert Charles Daly, O26707.  
Albert Guy Dancy, O26542.  
Charles David Daniel, O26744.  
Cecil George Dansby, O39452.  
Eugene Alexander Darrow, O26608.  
Robert Clinton Dart, O26552.  
Charles Junior Davis, O26491.  
Loren Everett Davis, O39444.  
Robert Edward Davis, O38307.  
Robert Sherwood Day, O26490.  
Harold Griswold DeArment, O26617.  
Edwin Radford Decker, O26510.  
Chalmer Lee Deeter, Jr., O26822.  
Andrew James DeGraff, O26696.  
Dale Denman, Jr., O26691.  
John Benedict Desmond, O26627.  
James Edward Devine, O39442.  
Herbert Fullerton Dickson 2d, O39446.  
Lester Reed Dillon, Jr., O50228.  
Armond DiSilvio, O26817.  
John Willson Donaldson, O26637.  
Wilfred LaVern Dondanville, O26658.  
James Shepard Douglas, O26625.  
James Albert Downs, Jr., O26800.  
Robert Evans Drake, O26621.  
Walter Duggan, O50053.  
James Wilkie Dunham, O26614.  
Oscar Eugene Duttweiler, Jr., O26908.  
Thomas Henry Eblen, O50018.  
Keith Edward Eller, O26533.  
John Sheldon Doud Eischenhower, O26607.  
Pat Kenneth Elliot, O38363.  
James Nelly Elliott, O50051.  
John Tyler Elliott, O26896.  
Edward Hampton Ellis, O50129.  
Lindley Corydon Ellis, O26849.  
Paul Caspar Emley, O26909.  
William Francis Enos, O26819.  
Alfe Levando Francis Erickson, O26915.  
Richard Erlenkotter, O26507.  
John Marshall Evans, O39493.  
Frank Gibson Everett, Jr., O56290.  
Robert Leahy Fair, O38357.  
Robert Denton Farmer, O56280.  
George Harold Farne, O26857.  
Louis Frank Felder, O38343.  
Edwin Lewis Fisher, O56309.  
Robert Newton Fleming, O50014.  
John Robert Flynn, O26881.  
Thomas Francis Flynn, Jr., O26646.  
William Layng Forker, O50125.  
Alva Jeoffrey Forsythe, O26640.  
William Bernard Fowlkes, O39456.  
Henry Minton Francis, O26715.  
Edwin Morris Freakley, O39440.  
Charles Francis Frock, O26731.  
Hezekiah Wyndol Carroll Furman, O39464.  
James Victor Gagne, Jr., O39450.  
Douglas Warren Gallez, O26594.  
Robert William Gentleman, O50006.  
Harold Burton Gibson, Jr., O38340.  
James Bascom Giles, Jr., O26634.  
Bryan Evans Gill, Jr., O56005.  
William Wesley Gist 3d, O38275.  
John Edward Glab, O26556.  
Abraham Merton Glass, O26780.  
Raymond Lee Gordon, Jr., O26870.  
Henry Augustus Grace, O26714.  
William Byron Graham, O26509.  
Philip Schuyler Grant, O26837.  
Ernest Graves, Jr., O26473.  
Fledding Lewis Greaves, O26656.  
Harry Charles Grevert, O56077.

Donald Alfred Gruenther, O26528.  
Walter Allen Guild, Jr., O26525.  
Paul Thomas Hackett, O38296.  
Gerald Dean Hall, O26647.  
Leslie Harrison Halstead, O26848.  
William Wesley Ham, Jr., O56183.  
Arthur Linton Handley, Jr., O26884.  
Robert Chase Hannum, O56048.  
Robert Odell Harper, O26593.  
Wilson Clark Harper, O26663.  
Douglas Lee Harris, O26763.  
Walter Rawlins Harris, O26585.  
William Paul Hastings, O50054.  
George Robert Hayman, Jr., O26576.  
Harold Ira Hayward, O26755.  
Vincent Joseph Hearing, O50126.  
Gerson Kirkland Heiss, Jr., O26613.  
John Joseph Hennessey, O26793.  
Edward Heacock Hibbard, O26855.  
Orman Eugene Hicks, O50224.  
Dallas Wilkinson Hoadley, O27012.  
Warren Dudley Hodges, O37869.  
Roy Albert Hoffman, O26726.  
Robert Lee Hollister, Jr., O56296.  
William MacGregor Home, O41259.  
Cecil Walton Hospelhorn, O50222.  
John Welsh Howell, O26487.  
John Stapleton Howland, O26589.  
Robert Edgar Huber, O50219.  
William Johnston Humma, O26861.  
Robert Henry Hurst, O26868.  
Arthur Slegmar Hyman, O26774.  
James Irvine, Jr., O26495.  
Clark Ostrom Irving, O56286.  
Saul Aaron Jackson, O26636.  
Leverett Norton Jenks, O26680.  
Charles Spurgeon Johnson, Jr., O26866.  
William Fredrick Johnson, O38325.  
Wesley David Jones, O50226.  
Daniel Peter Juraschek, O50234.  
Wilbur Leonard Kahn, O26631.  
David Berrey Keezell, O56136.  
Frederick John Keifer, Jr., O26927.  
Edward Elkins Kelleher, O56015.  
Charles Leonard Kelley, O50168.  
Andrew King Keller, O26474.  
Robert Mulkey Kelly, O38367.  
Robin Schofield Kendall, O26825.  
William Clark Kennedy, O26720.  
Jack Frederick Kettler, O50003.  
John Franklin Kimbel, O26480.  
Warden Russel Kimmins, O56304.  
Leo Douglas Kinnard, O26736.  
Harold Arthur Kissinger, O39445.  
John Alfred Kjellstrom, O38252.  
Erwin Howard Kleist, O26504.  
Lorin Russell Klinge, O26738.  
Dallas Loyd Knoll, Jr., O26550.  
Albert Leon Kotzebue, O56184.  
Frederick James Kroesen, Jr., O50095.  
Laurence Joseph Kunkel, O50183.  
Henry Paul Kutichinski, Jr., O26734.  
Jean Belair LaMarre, O26539.  
Harry David Latimer, O38320.  
Thomas Edward Lawrence, O26835.  
Ralph Elmer Layman, Jr., O49996.  
Bryan Henry Leeper, O26579.  
Archer Lynn Lerch, Jr., O26735.  
Roger Joseph Lilly, O56302.  
William Carl Lindahl, O38379.  
Kermit Orvill Lindell, O26530.  
Rodney Walter Lindell, O26719.  
Leonard Francis Lopez, O56311.  
Joseph Wesley Losch, O26812.  
Theodore Ross MacKechnie, O38287.  
Donald Gribble MacWilliams, O26551.  
Frank Cadie Mahin, Jr., O26489.  
Alexander Morton Maish, O26523.  
John William Mallory, O56135.  
Eubert Harrison Malone, Jr., O38253.  
John Francis Mangan, O26742.  
Simon Seelig Marks, O26847.  
Robert Carroll Marsett, O38352.  
Arthur Roy Marshall, O26584.  
Max Lawrence Marshall, O26867.  
Orville Wells Martin, Jr., O50102.  
Robert Taylor Martin, O26641.  
Stephen Goode Martin, O41261.  
Robert Gilbert Matte, O56106.  
Ray Burgess May, O38259.  
John Ogden Mayhall, O55744.



Charles Brooks McAllister, Jr., O50056.  
 Dennis Philip McAuliffe, O26609.  
 Edwin Joseph McCarran, O50214.  
 Alfred Mudge McCoy, Jr., O26544.  
 Charles Rodney McFadden, O50045.  
 Thomas Joseph McGuire, Jr., O26733.  
 Bernard Edward McKeever, Jr., O26789.  
 James Owen McKenna, O38369.  
 Edward Dickinson Meares, O56013.  
 Francis Everett Mendenhall, Jr., O38303.  
 Howard Charles Metzler, O26521.  
 Edward Miccio, Jr., O50013.  
 Gerald St. Claire Mickle, Jr., O26709.  
 Troy Houston Middleton, Jr., O39454.  
 Ralph Henderson Miller, Jr., O38248.  
 Edgar Norman Millington, O26759.  
 Robert Stephen Mills, O26939.  
 Clarence Andrew Mitchell, Jr., O26903.  
 Robert Ferdinand Mitchell, O56291.  
 Cornelius John Molloy, Jr., O26792.  
 Luis Antonio Monserrate, O50197.  
 Franklin Boyd Moon, O26511.  
 Frank Edward Moore, Jr., O26865.  
 Spurgeon Allen Moore, O38370.  
 Thomas Edward Moore, Jr., O26615.  
 Wallace James Moulis, O26863.  
 Steve Watson Mulkey, Jr., O26724.  
 Robert McClellan Mummey, O26610.  
 Maxwell Cole Murphy, Jr., O26768.  
 Robert Houston Murphy, O26650.  
 William Best Murray, O26652.  
 Gordon Ray Myers, O38250.  
 Paul Elden Myers, O50062.  
 Richard Nalle, O26716.  
 Patrick McAlester Nellond, O26616.  
 Arthur Derry Nelson, O26545.  
 William John Nelson, O26572.  
 William Robert Nettles, Jr., O50044.  
 Robert Lee Nicol, O56367.  
 Robert Tharp Nixon, O26563.  
 Colman Noahson, O50232.  
 William Douglas Nold, O38247.  
 William Sterling Norman, O50071.  
 James Kenneth O'Brien, O26535.  
 Edwin Thomas O'Donnell, O26527.  
 David Hugh Oglesby, Jr., O56370.  
 Oliver Emil O'Kier, O50039.  
 Eugene Theodore Olson, O49987.  
 David Ewing Ott, O26522.  
 James Blakely Owings, O41254.  
 George Steve Pappas, O26784.  
 Robert White Parks, O26694.  
 Nels August Parson, Jr., O26713.  
 Alan Lyon Partridge, O26770.  
 Oliver Beirne Patton, O26747.  
 Robert McIntyre Pearce, O26721.  
 James Gerard Pelland, O38286.  
 Roberto Peralta, O56305.  
 Carl Leroy Peterson, Jr., O26692.  
 John Thornton Peterson, O26901.  
 Joseph Carlton Petrone, Jr., O26813.  
 Dee William Pettigrew, Jr., O26717.  
 Tom Lewis Peyton, Jr., O50117.  
 Paul Washington Phillips, O26611.  
 Robert Gist Pickens, O26808.  
 George Edward Pickett 4th, O26828.  
 John Raymond Pierce, Jr., O38381.  
 John Theodore Pierce 3d, O38319.  
 John Christopher Pile, O26699.  
 Edwin Caryl Pittenger, Jr., O38378.  
 Kern Phillips Pitts, O26718.  
 Jack Murph Pollin, O26520.  
 John Francis Powers, Jr., O38350.  
 Joseph William Powers, O50190.  
 Lemuel Ira Presley, O50254.  
 Francisco Jaime Ramos, O50174.  
 Warren Elliott Reed, O50231.  
 Philip Ambrose Revolvinsky, O50139.  
 Robert Edmund Rich, O50002.  
 Howard Wade Richards, O26689.  
 Allen Pierce Richmond 3d, O50068.  
 George Bernard Robbins, Jr., O50176.  
 Vernon Everett Robbins, O26871.  
 Robert Boyd Robinson, O26531.  
 Francis Paul Robles, O50105.  
 Robert Morris Rodden, O26588.  
 Otis Hardison Rodgers, O50049.  
 Dixon Carle Rogers, O26595.  
 Harry Lovejoy Rogers 3d, O26578.  
 Thomas Alfred Roller, O56153.  
 Thomas Gerald Rosell, O41294.

William Edgar Ross, O50151.  
 Robert Kelly Routh, O26850.  
 Paul James Rowan, O38288.  
 Robert Warren Samuel, O26723.  
 Edward Worthington Samuel, Jr., O26668.  
 Bruton Burke Schardt, O26757.  
 Walter Andrew Schmidt, O38346.  
 Walter Earle Schneider, O38366.  
 Fred Bradley Schoomaker, O38249.  
 Robert Joseph Schram, O56372.  
 Ralph Anthony Sciolla, O26628.  
 James Franklin Scoggin, Jr., O26472.  
 George Albert Scott, Jr., O38310.  
 Winfield S. Scott, O26697.  
 Robert Warren Selton, O26678.  
 Jack Frederick Senechal, O56382.  
 Robert Francis Shannon, O26860.  
 Joseph Richards Shelton, Jr., O26781.  
 Elwood Howard Shemwell, O56066.  
 Norman Cornelius Shepard, Jr., O26654.  
 William Dade Sherman, O50184.  
 William Madison Shirey, O26635.  
 William Phillip Short, Jr., O38345.  
 LeRoy Oliver Sidfrid, O39441.  
 David Linton Silver, Jr., O26919.  
 Leonard Henderson Sims, Jr., O26786.  
 John Roger Siska, O38289.  
 Harold Blackwood Sloan, O26624.  
 Albert Cowper Smith, Jr., O50121.  
 Ellsworth Fandel Smith, O39449.  
 Frederick Adair Smith, Jr., O26494.  
 James Clifton Smith, O38314.  
 Robert Alexander Smith, O26679.  
 Robert Sylvan Smith, Jr., O50000.  
 Stephen Harrison Smith, O26632.  
 Eugene Cleaver Snedeker, O50011.  
 Hollice Henry Snyder, O49998.  
 Walter Hugh Snelling, O26752.  
 Beverly Carradine Snow, Jr., O26499.  
 William Frederic Spalding, O26488.  
 John Berhart Sperry, O56300.  
 Spencer Gregg Stanley, Jr., O38301.  
 Bruce Ingle Staser, O26842.  
 Charles Lowndes Steel, Jr., O26546.  
 Otto William Steinhardt, O26503.  
 James Wilson Stephens, O56149.  
 Hulen Dorris Stogner, O38373.  
 William McGregor Stowell, O26682.  
 Robert Homer Strecker, O26853.  
 Robert Douglas Strook, O50098.  
 William Brennan Strough, O56129.  
 John Stephen Sullivan, Jr., O26904.  
 Frederick Sweet, O38332.  
 Thomas McKee Tarpley, O26827.  
 George Tassey, O38348.  
 John Alton Tate, O38322.  
 Dudley Keith Terry, O50076.  
 John Teselle, O50055.  
 Donald Foster Thompson, O26514.  
 Gerald Jack Thouvenelle, O50060.  
 Reed Anderson Thursby, O38383.  
 John James Tkacik, O26590.  
 William Neely Todd 3d, O26846.  
 Philip Barrett Toon, O26799.  
 Vernon Marcus Tootle, O41287.  
 John Case Trimmer, O26633.  
 Corbie Ralph Truman, O26883.  
 Larkin Smith Tully, O26929.  
 Claude Earl Turner, O50230.  
 George Albert Tuttle, O26583.  
 William Benjamin Tuttle, Jr., O26941.  
 Earle Louis Valenstein, O50040.  
 William Teunis Van Atten, O38274.  
 Edward Newton Van Duyn 3d, O41270.  
 Anthony Jack Vitullo, O26760.  
 William Edward Wallace, O50100.  
 James Clyde Waller, Jr., O50167.  
 Luther Daniel Wallis, Jr., O26592.  
 Leland Dwight Wamsted, O50179.  
 Dennis Joseph Wardell, O50237.  
 Richard Samuel Ware, Jr., O26688.  
 George Elmer Wear, O26783.  
 James Wesley Weathers, Jr., O26879.  
 Maurice Stevenson Weaver, O50094.  
 James Buell Webel, O39463.  
 Donald Homer Weihs, O56001.  
 John Thomas Wells 3d, O26911.  
 Robert Rogers Wessels, O26630.  
 Alan Evans Weston, O26519.  
 Wallace William Weyant, O39461.  
 Grady Olan White, O26791.

James Todd White, Jr., O26541.  
 William Blackburn White 4th, O26873.  
 Kenneth Guy Whitehead, O38364.  
 Jesse Walter Whitley, O50070.  
 James Richard Wilson, O56352.  
 Samuel Vaughan Wilson, O36566.  
 Herbert Barry Winkler, O50198.  
 Clarence Emanuel Wolfinger, Jr., O26831.  
 David Perry Wood, Jr., O26612.  
 Homer Alden Wright, O56134.  
 Frederick William Yanker, O38351.  
 Mason James Young, Jr., O26603.  
 David Zillmer, O26722.

*To be lieutenant colonel, Veterinary Corps*  
 Russell McNellis, O18935.

*To be captain, Medical Service Corps*  
 Egbert Venoy Bunker, O39492.  
 John William Northing, Jr., O38557.

*To be major, Chaplains*  
 Irwin Cornelius Bailey, Jr., O43141.  
 Elmer Carl Harre, O51977.  
 Denis George Moore, O30969.  
 Urban Joseph Wurm, O30971.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) have been examined for physical fitness and found physically qualified for promotion. All others are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be first lieutenant*  
 Dexter William Adams, O62247.  
 Howard Edward Adams, O57244.  
 Albert Nathan Abelson, O57434.  
 Harry Thomas Adkins, Jr., O57289.  
 John Robert Ahern, O59918.  
 Karl Earl Akin, O59900.  
 Albert Feleclano Alfonso, O57240.  
 William Edward Allen, O60661.  
 Kenneth Smith Anderson, Jr., O62252.  
 Reuben Livingston Anderson, Jr., O57129.  
 Eugene Keith Andreasen, O57431.  
 David Wesley Armstrong, O57208.  
 Nemesio Antonio Armstrong, O59898.  
 Emmett Richard Arnold, O60396.  
 Joel David Aron, O57076.  
 Lewis Jordan Ashley, O62231.  
 Thomas Young Awalt, Jr., O57496.  
 Nell Rice Ayer, O57248.  
 Gus Backhaus 3d, O60714.  
 Alfred Adolph Baeuchle, O59901.  
 Andrew William Baird, O57459.  
 Doric William Jemison Ball, O62258.  
 William Ripley Ballou, O60701.  
 William Reid Bandeen, O57193.  
 Robert Lawrence Bangert, O60217.  
 Richard John Barbero, O60717.  
 James William Barnett, Jr., O57087.  
 Gerald Wanner Barnitz, O60669.  
 George Rodney Barrow, O59480.  
 Sam Louis Barth, O57511.  
 John Baynard Baxley, O59919.  
 Hayden Julian Bayer, O57286.  
 Walter Beinke, O57357.  
 Daniel Randall Beirne, O57366.  
 John Bellinger Bellinger, Jr., O57136.  
 Glen Dean Belnap, O63088.  
 Adolph Louis Belser, O59913.  
 Sidney Bryan Berry, Jr., O57233.  
 Russell Wayne Berthoff, Jr., O63083.  
 Edward Hiltner Bertram, Jr., O57327.  
 Eugene Stanton Blier, O57311.  
 William Roy Blierwirth, O62245.  
 Thomas George Blair, O60678.  
 James Arthur Blakeslee, O57272.  
 Rexford John Blodgett, O60657.  
 Charles Arthur Borg, Jr., O57078.  
 Harry William Borgia, O60710.  
 Keith Alden Boss, O57308.  
 Thomas Willard Bowen, O57090.  
 Joseph Key Bratton, O57077.  
 Vincent Merlin Brazier, O60653.  
 John William Brennan, O57124.  
 William Neale Bringham, O60665.  
 William Erven Brockmeier, O57651.  
 Donald Broida, O60641.

- Glenn Preston Brooks, O60694.  
 Thomas Wiley Buchanan, O60835.  
 Harry Augustine Buckley, Jr., O57335.  
 William Claiborne Buckner, O57175.  
 William Curoe Burns, O57092.  
 William Edmund Byers, O57200.  
 Elmer Irvin Caldwell, O59778.  
 William Burns Caldwell, O57280.  
 Edward Francis Callanan, O57215.  
 Francis Paul Cancelliere, O57287.  
 Jack Lee Capps, O57322.  
 Marco Joseph Caraccia, O57694.  
 Robert Enoch Carlson, O57646.  
 Murray Lee Carroll, O57442.  
 Ircel Lee Carter, O60836.  
 Leslie Dillon Carter, Jr., O57270.  
 Donald Albert Cerow, O57315.  
 Michael Cerrone, O62254.  
 Lewis Chandler, O57339.  
 William Woodruff Chandler, O57493.  
 John Warren Chism, O57676.  
 John Howell Chitty, Jr., O57254.  
 Lake George Churchill, Jr., O57312.  
 Richard Walter Clark, O62242.  
 Thomas Ryan Clark, O57148.  
 Carter Weldon Clarke, Jr., O57314.  
 Thomas Fauntleroy Clendenin, O60605.  
 John Melvin Coales, O59814.  
 Sam Grady Cockerham, O57340.  
 Ray Wesley Coffey, O57457.  
 Thomas Hardy Collins, O59895.  
 William Ira Compton, O57447.  
 Rodney Robert Confer, O59865.  
 Paul Darvin Conlin, O60640.  
 Roger Frankland Conover, O57105.  
 John Wadsworth Consolvo, O60215.  
 Carroll Monroe Cook, Jr., O60638.  
 Robert James Cook, O59922.  
 William Loch Cook 2d, O57123.  
 Richmond James Cooper, O57155.  
 Lloyd Allan Corkan, Jr., O59811.  
 James Corey, O57464.  
 Thomas Bledsoe Cormack, O57125.  
 William Jennings Cribb, Jr., O60695.  
 Paul Miles Crosby, O60837.  
 Charles Lanham Crouch, O57269.  
 Floyd Manring Cummings, O62835.  
 Robert Hamilton Cushing, O57147.  
 William Dean Dally, O59915.  
 Ralph Edward Davis, O59813.  
 Philip Stevens Day, Jr., O57349.  
 Donald Edward Deehan, O57181.  
 Albert P. Dempsey, Jr., O57443.  
 James Webster Dingeman, O57260.  
 John Joseph Doody, O57360.  
 Joseph Pembroke Dorsey, O57217.  
 Mercer McConnico Doty, O57221.  
 Marlboro Randolph Downes, O59910.  
 Lee Thomas Doyle, O57115.  
 Clinton Arthur Drury, Jr., O57517.  
 Raymond Cameron Drury, Jr., O57109.  
 Clyde Dunn, Jr., O60654.  
 Howard William Durham, O59902.  
 Eugene Michael Dutchak, O57458.  
 Frank Hashbrouck Earle, O60831.  
 Richard John Eaton, O62227.  
 John Spier Egbert, O57103.  
 Howard Hill Eichelsdoerfer, O60718.  
 Duane Lee Emerson, O57106.  
 X Earl Evans Emerson, Jr., O57642.  
 Wallace Owens Enderle, O57196.  
 Robert Laverne Engellen, O60660.  
 David Engberg Etzold, O62251.  
 George William Everett, O60685.  
 John Charles Fairlamb, O60681.  
 Ferdinand Ferrer, O62831.  
 Donald Paul Fink, O62236.  
 Robert Richard Finnegan, O57329.  
 James John Flaggert, Jr., O63345.  
 George Seward Fleeson, O59486.  
 Gordon Keith Fleischman, O59477.  
 Eugene Calvin Fleming, Jr., O57372.  
 Charles Verner Pollett, Jr., O62003.  
 Joe Anthony Font, O57454.  
 Ashby Minor Foote, Jr., O37229.  
 John Othor Ford, O60891.  
 Eugene Priest Forrester, O57250.  
 Charles Nelson French, Jr., O57112.  
 James Clyde Fry, Jr., O57373.  
 Azel Greene Frye, Jr., O60653.  
 James Smith Gaines, O60655.  
 John Keith Garrett, O60684.  
 Shirley Dwayne Garrett, O60687.  
 David Draper Garrison, O57363.  
 Pierce Horatio Gaver, Jr., O57202.  
 Sam Francis Gaziano, O59807.  
 Lowell Burke Genebach, Jr., O57156.  
 William Louis Gerardy, O60667.  
 Thomas Boone Giboney, Jr., O60708.  
 William Duncan Gillis, O62833.  
 John Patrick Gilman, O57640.  
 Louis Onorato Giuffrida, O59903.  
 Anthony Percival Glasser, O59810.  
 Dale Russell Godsey, O63284.  
 George Walter Gordon, O57643.  
 Maxwell Grabove, O59771.  
 Herbert Otto Graeser, O62002.  
 Robert Elwood Graf, O57083.  
 Douglas Malcolm Graham, O57510.  
 Edward Greer, O57426.  
 George Alfred Greetham, O63342.  
 Lorraine Mahlon Griffin, O63084.  
 Stephen Murray Griffith, O57165.  
 Sidney Charles Guthrie, O57451.  
 Spencer Val Halgren, O57644.  
 James Burnus Hall, O57197.  
 Robert Francis Hallahan, O57251.  
 John Duncan Hamilton, O57343.  
 William Harold Harper, O60670.  
 Lonnie Edward Harrington, Jr., O57681.  
 Richard Stanley Harsh, O57303.  
 George William Hartnell, O57302.  
 Louis William Haskell, Jr., O57283.  
 Jay Allan Hatch, O57143.  
 Leander Russell Hathaway, Jr., O60645.  
 Richard Dean Haugen, O62832.  
 Earl Clark Haynes, O60658.  
 Thomas William Hazard, Jr., O57319.  
 Ellsworth William Heidenreich, O60214.  
 Thomas James Heller, O57924.  
 Leonard Jack Hempling, O59784.  
 Jess Byrd Hendricks, Jr., O57168.  
 Joseph Shindler Herbets, O57206.  
 Lawson Richard Hillman, O63344.  
 James Eugene Hilmar, O60651.  
 Norman Parrish Hinges, O60652.  
 Hugh French Thomason Hoffman, Jr., O57259.  
 John Joseph Hoffman, Jr., O62255.  
 Sam Cromwell Holliday, O57336.  
 James Frank Hooker, Jr., O57138.  
 Charles Samuel Horn, O57205.  
 Lawrence Vinton Hoyt, O57218.  
 Wallace Henley Hubbard, O57172.  
 John Bell Hughes, Jr., O57160.  
 Douglas Theodore Hule, O57266.  
 Quentin Lee Humbert, O59897.  
 David Haley Hunter, O63335.  
 Harold Hutchinson, O57516.  
 Rufus Johnston Hyman, O57326.  
 Alfonso John Iaderosa, O60635.  
 Benedict Ralph Jacobellis, O57228.  
 Lloyd Kenneth Jensen, O59788.  
 William Francis Jester, O57490.  
 Carlton Sawyer Johnson, O63121.  
 Charles McCandles Johnson, O57650.  
 Clayton Edward Johnson, O62244.  
 J. Wesley Jones, Jr., O57307.  
 James Lloyd Jones, O57150.  
 Louis Raymond Jones, O57214.  
 Paul Edward Jones, O62234.  
 Rees Jones, O57235.  
 Thomas Tytherleigh Jones, O57113.  
 William Freeman Jordan, O60704.  
 Delbert Anthony Jurden, O62241.  
 Kenneth Franklin Kast, Jr., O62239.  
 Phillip Kaufman, O63092.  
 William Mason Kaula, O57089.  
 Paul Junior Kay, O60126.  
 John Patrick Kean, O57345.  
 Thomas Francis Keegan, Jr., O60676.  
 Lawrence Manning Kellam, O61099.  
 Jack Eugene Kelley, O60711.  
 Thomas William Kelley, O61240.  
 Jesse Tompkins Kelsey, O57274.  
 Robert Walsh Kennedy, O60729.  
 Joseph Mortimer Kiernan, Jr., O57075.  
 Robert Lee Kirwan, O57252.  
 Edward Thomas Klett, Jr., O57323.  
 Albert Clayton Knapp, O59920.  
 Oscar Frederic Kochtitzky, Jr., O57316.  
 Kendall Wayne Korems, O62246.  
 Seymour Kravitz, O59492.  
 Robert Joseph Kriwanek, O60648.  
 John Edward Lambert, O57450.  
 Renn Metsker Lawrence, O57696.  
 James Edward Lawson, O62260.  
 X Julien Harvey LePage, O59476.  
 Albert Rushworth Livingston, O60707.  
 John David Lewis, O60682.  
 Mose Edward Lewis 3d, O59904.  
 John Wilson Liddle, O62233.  
 Harvey Robinson Livesay, Jr., O57114.  
 Herlihy Townsend Long, O60715.  
 John Henry Longbottom, O59916.  
 Alma Gill Longstroth, O60666.  
 Lloyd Edward Lorentzen, O59487.  
 Norman Bertram Lovejoy, O57118.  
 Charles Bertram Lowden, O60642.  
 José Hamilton Lowry, O57495.  
 Benjamin Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., O57425.  
 James Edgar Macklin, Jr., O57225.  
 John Hayes Maddox, O59912.  
 David Saltontall Mallett, O57257.  
 James Ward Mann, O57497.  
 John Ruel Manning, Jr., O57463.  
 John Calvin Maple, O57346.  
 Walter Frank Marciniec, O57133.  
 Robert Wiley Marshall, O57284.  
 James Slocumb Martin, O57660.  
 Robert Joseph Martin, O62253.  
 Wilmer Charles Marvin, O57641.  
 Phillip Lee Mason O60728.  
 John Joseph Masters, O60697.  
 Louis George Mathern, Jr., O63349.  
 William Maughn, Jr., O63085.  
 X Roy Russell May, Jr., O59809.  
 Milton Earl McCaig, O62240.  
 Billy Mitchell McCarver, O62228.  
 Frank Lee McClaffin, O57369.  
 Don Stuart McClelland, O57247.  
 Eugene Burton McCoy, O63089.  
 Paul Griffith McCoy, O59501.  
 James Lewellen McCravy, O60649.  
 James Gordon McCray, O57277.  
 John Joachim McCuen, O57185.  
 John Winn McEnery, O57184.  
 Horace Stephen McGahee, O60690.  
 Donald Charles McGraw, O57207.  
 Samuel Horace McKenty, Jr., O63328.  
 Eric Livingston McLendon, O63340.  
 Houston Moore McMurray, O57371.  
 Homer Charles McNamara, Jr., O57432.  
 David William McNeely, O57364.  
 Garland Ray McSpadden, O57139.  
 John Leonard Meakin, O59907.  
 Gerald William Medsger, O57080.  
 Edward Stanley Mehosky, O60688.  
 Walter Edwin Meinzen, O57242.  
 X Francis Meredith, Jr., O57498.  
 Donald Jensen Metcalf, O60712.  
 Joseph Henry Meyer, O57153.  
 Jack Rowland Miller, O57296.  
 John McKenna Milton, O57341.  
 Donald Gardner Moore, O60832.  
 Fred Samuel Moore, O62257.  
 Herbert Spencer Moore, Jr., O60677.  
 Charles Morrow, Jr., O58983.  
 Harry Weil Morse, O63294.  
 Albert Richard Moses, O62235.  
 Harry Fisher Mumma, O57456.  
 Robert Arthur Munford, O57448.  
 Charles Martin Murray, O60680.  
 Vernon Leslie Nash, Jr., O59921.  
 Edwin Blakely Nelson, O57167.  
 John Masters Nolan, O57452.  
 Wayne Denzil Norwood, O60693.  
 William Richard Notbohm, O60643.  
 Edward Hays O'Donnell, O57683.  
 Kenneth William Olson, O57146.  
 Carlo Joseph Ortenzi, O57515.  
 John Luke Osteen, Jr., O57285.  
 Alfred Arthur Pabst, O57169.  
 Donald Flint Packard, O57162.  
 William Ashbrook Patch, O57281.  
 Edwin Dennis Patterson, O57110.  
 William Henry Patterson, Jr., O58995.  
 Charles Grove Payne, Jr., O60637.  
 Ralph Winston Pearson, O57298.  
 Harrison Perry, O57096.  
 Hugh Wiston Perry, O57288.  
 Robert James Petersen, O57334.  
 Hartwin Ray Peterson, O60713.  
 Edgar Leland Petty, Jr., O62249.  
 William Richard Phillips, Jr., O63304.  
 Galen Woodsum Pike, O57444.



Harvey Dorkin Piper, O57449.  
 Joseph Piserchia, O60656.  
 Joseph Edward Pizzi, O60216.  
 Walter William Plummer, Jr., O57182.  
 James Edward Joe, O60700.  
 John Justine Polcastro, O62226.  
 David Daniel Powell, O57682.  
 Kenneth Irving Pressman, O57157.  
 Leonard Lee Preston, O57430.  
 Richard Thomas Pumphrey, O60703.  
 Walter Wheat Redd, O57441.  
 James Francis Reidy, O60636.  
 Saul Martin Resnick, O57190.  
 Donald Hood Reynolds, O63035.  
 James Warren Richardson, Jr., O57273.  
 Frank Paul Ringenbach, Jr., O60706.  
 Neal Hart Roach, O60689.  
 John Ford Roberts, O59914.  
 Claron Atherton Robertson, Jr., O57107.  
 Jack Liggett Robertson, O60716.  
 Lem Frank Robinson, Jr., O57231.  
 Norman Leander Robinson, Jr., O57210.  
 Houston Strode Roby, O62834.  
 Warren William Rossman, O63235.  
 Edwin A. Rudd, O57211.  
 James Cornelius Ruddell, Jr., O57177.  
 Kenneth Edward Ruddy, O57239.  
 Gerald Frederick Ruschmeyer, O62229.  
 Donald Paul Rush, O62232.  
 William Thomas Ryan, O57358.  
 X James Howard Sanders, O59908.  
 George William Sandrock, O59905.  
 Alfred Albert Sanelli, O60212.  
 Arnold Melville Sargeant, Jr., O57313.  
 Edward Walter Sargeant, O62250.  
 Melvin Dean Schiller, O60668.  
 Robert Charles Schindling, O57645.  
 William Francis Schless, O57278.  
 Walter Burns Schlotterbeck, O57195.  
 Carl Walter Schmidt, O57241.  
 Willard Warren Scott, Jr., O57098.  
 James Harley Sellers, O60834.  
 Paul A. Seymour, Jr., O60664.  
 Merle Gardner Sheffield, O57173.  
 Robert Daniel Sheppard, Jr., O57800.  
 Thomas Paul Shiely, O57437.  
 Charles Harwood Shook, O57120.  
 William Alvin Shuster, 2d, O57179.  
 Harwell Fitzhugh Smith, Jr., O57130.  
 Lowell Harold Smith, O60705.  
 Samuel Lee Smith, O59917.  
 Vance Owen Smith, O63346.  
 Dillon Snell, O62230.  
 John Thad Southerland, O60659.  
 Donn Albert Starry, O57249.  
 Harry John Sternburg, O57209.  
 Guy Stone, O60213.  
 X Robert Preston Story, O57654.  
 Charles Henry Sunder, O57327.  
 Orville David Severson, O63090.  
 Fred Grant Swafford, Jr., O63087.  
 George Alvis Swearingen, O57321.  
 Edward Parry Sykes, Jr., O57102.  
 Loren Hanna Sylvester, O62243.  
 Donald Lee Synolds, O57670.  
 Stanley Eugene Tabor, O60663.  
 J. Robert Taylor, O57226.  
 Mack Taylor, Jr., O57427.  
 William Morris Taylor, O57453.  
 William Gwyn Thomas, Jr., O57144.  
 Frederick Edwin Tibbetts, 3d, O57164.  
 Lawrence Doran Thompson, O60644.  
 James Edward Townes, Jr., O59906.  
 Francis Aloysius Travers, Jr., O60709.  
 William Harrison Travis, O57292.  
 William Herman Tucker, Jr., O63322.  
 Jack Kay Tuthill, O60833.  
 James Gates Tuthill, O57132.  
 Guy Isbell Tutwiler, O60698.  
 William Milam Twitty, O59808.  
 Thomas Burdick Tyree, O57111.  
 Jack Carr Uley, O57519.  
 Fernand Richard Van Laethem, O63350.  
 Miles Cornelious Vaughan, Jr., O62259.  
 Clifton Franklr. Vincent, O57440.  
 Brady Luther Vogt, Jr., O60647.  
 Robert Leroy Vogt, O60691.  
 Elmer Cornelius Vreeland, Jr., O57212.  
 John Baker Wadsworth, Jr., O57297.  
 John Garnett Waggoner, O57084.  
 Fred Emerson Wagoner, Jr., O57253.

John Emory Walden, 2d, O57684.  
 James Frederick Walk, O57300.  
 Herbert Henry Walta, O63343.  
 Lyle Edward Walter, O57173.  
 Robert Marion Ward, O57158.  
 Thomas Allen Ware, Jr., O57219.  
 Kenneth Eugene Webber, Jr., O57220.  
 Herman Webel, Jr., O59899.  
 Richard Glenn Weber, O57192.  
 John Mosley Welch O57799.  
 Harold Leroy Wheeler, O60696.  
 Ennis Clement Whitehead, Jr., O57093.  
 Robert Allison Whitfield, O57317.  
 Arthur Langley Whitley, O57099.  
 Philip McIlvaine Whitney, Jr., O57318.  
 William Wallace Whitson, O57097.  
 Herman Edwin Wienecke, O60673.  
 Glenn Castle Wilhide, Jr., O57189.  
 Theodore Courtlandt Williams, Jr., O57462.  
 Walworth Forman Williams, O57316.  
 Edwin Craft Wilson, O60650.  
 Leo Louis Wilson, O62836.  
 Andrew Benedict Witko, O57170.  
 Jack Wayne Woltmon, O60686.  
 Dean Ralph Woodward, O62237.  
 Charles Darwin Wright, O60662.  
 Charles Scott Wylie, O57512.  
 George Everett Yarberry, O60646.  
 John Dewitt Yarbrough, O62238.  
 Walter Edward Yerkes, O57455.  
 David Robert Young, O63091.

#### *To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Fred Herman Diercks, O60890.  
 William Stephen Rooney, O60892.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and crops specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the Act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress subject to physical qualification:

#### *To be majors*

George R. Clammer MC, O991812.  
 Karl D. MacMillan, MC, O262311.  
 Elmer R. Smith, MC, O477324.

#### *To be captains*

Rebecca V. Amend, ANC, N724936.  
 Mary E. Angelich, ANC, N773782.  
 Ella L. Baggett, ANC, N726208.  
 Mary R. Barker, ANC, N726392.  
 Johanna E. B. Baskin, ANC, N790607.  
 Eva K. Belflower, ANC, N763377.  
 Alice J. Bender, ANC, N769341.  
 A. Regina Bennett, ANC, N787212.  
 Audrey M. Benoit, ANC, N776452.  
 Mary J. Berg, ANC, N763476.  
 Alma J. Berkebile, ANC, N762693.  
 Gnida M. Blackburn, ANC, N768800.  
 Jeanette M. Bodis, ANC, N759893.  
 Emiline A. Bourgeois, ANC, N779679.  
 Frances R. Breen, ANC, N765354.  
 Irene E. Brower, ANC, N786789.  
 Virginia L. Brown, ANC, N763910.  
 Charles O. Bruce, Jr., MC, O465652.  
 Kathryn V. Buck, WMSC, R2259.  
 Helen E. Burns, ANC, N725713.  
 Marian W. Candon, ANC, N767220.  
 Elizabeth O. Carville, ANC, N726511.  
 Flora B. Cate, ANC, N787912.  
 Dorothy W. Cavanaugh, ANC, N737697.  
 Bertie L. Christman, ANC, N732012.  
 Gertrude R. Clarke, ANC, N742610.  
 Marie A. Comina, ANC, N730189.  
 Robert W. Cranston, Jr., MC, O1727051.  
 Tillie H. Creaney, ANC, N724118.  
 Edna E. Crittenden, ANC, N744837.  
 Mary B. Cullen, ANC, N744397.  
 Eleanor R. Cunningham, ANC, N722342.  
 Rytia M. Curley, ANC, N798931.  
 Sarah R. Curtis, ANC, N727481.  
 Elizabeth Dean, ANC, N727097.  
 Helen M. DePollo, ANC, N729300.  
 Dorothy A. DeWyze, ANC, N743208.  
 Evelyn E. Dial, ANC, N727568.  
 Edna L. Dillon, WMSC, M1077.  
 Marjorie E. Donahue, ANC, N751353.  
 Sadie B. Douglas, ANC, N797114.  
 Judith M. Drumm, ANC, N733197.  
 Maxine E. Dunlap, ANC, N768438.  
 Sarah K. Early, ANC, N725803.  
 Grace T. Eddins, ANC, N702860.  
 Alliene E. Ehalt, ANC, N769752.  
 Jack Eskridge, MC, O994010.  
 Eleanor S. Faust, ANC, N794630.  
 Isabel Fennon, ANC, N723072.  
 Gladys R. Fitzgerald, ANC, N742912.  
 Jack C. Fitzpatrick, MC, O936702.  
 Teresa M. Flanagan, ANC, N723012.  
 Florence L. Fletterer, ANC, N773405.  
 Mary M. Fowler, ANC, N769995.  
 Bernadine M. Frandrup, ANC, N736111.  
 Mary J. Franklin, ANC, N779540.  
 Della Freeman, ANC, N797722.  
 Margaret A. Galton, ANC, N722190.  
 Kathryn M. Gappa, ANC, N772185.  
 Elizabeth L. Gates, ANC, N702578.  
 Helen B. Gearin, WMSC, R10000.  
 Loretta R. Glynn, ANC, N772110.  
 Flora E. Goodrich, ANC, N721747.  
 Josephine M. Green, ANC, N744707.  
 Melvin L. Gumm, MC, O478936.  
 Ethel E. L. Hall, ANC, N753732.  
 Margaret C. Heim, ANC, N799397.  
 Ione E. Hergert, ANC, N737254.  
 Eleanor M. Hoppock, ANC, N771439.  
 Florence M. Hoppough, ANC, N743504.  
 Leona E. Horan, ANC, N724155.  
 Lula J. Howard, ANC, N734319.  
 Grace L. Hull, ANC, N790400.  
 Jean W. Innes, ANC, N771145.  
 Marian C. Itse, ANC, N776120.  
 Hendrina Jankowski, ANC, N784141.  
 Irene M. Jensen, ANC, N788208.  
 Cleo D. Johnson, ANC, N765037.  
 Inez M. Johnson, ANC, N737201.  
 Elizabeth C. Jones, WMSC, M524.  
 Opal M. Jones, ANC, N755439.  
 Dorothy B. Keays, ANC, N721042.  
 Agnes E. Kierepka, ANC, N725571.  
 Helen E. King, ANC, N727889.  
 Cecelia T. Klainer, WMSC, R17.  
 Mildred E. Klineyoung, ANC, N756024.  
 Marie C. Kramolis, ANC, N730192.  
 Margaret P. Ladd, WMSC, M1071.  
 Martha L. Lark, ANC, N729181.  
 Florie M. Larson, ANC, N741613.  
 Mary R. Lenny, ANC, N800141.  
 Alice A. Lentz, ANC, N789934.  
 Mary T. Leonard, ANC, N720014.  
 Eoline G. Lewis, ANC, N789928.  
 Verna E. MacDonald, ANC, N757145.  
 Myrtle D. Massie, ANC, N725339.  
 Helen L. Matthews, ANC, N763355.  
 Doris V. Matthias, ANC, N784055.  
 Mam' H. Maxwell, ANC, N728856.  
 Frances S. McCord, ANC, N726520.  
 Agnes C. McDonald, ANC, N723732.  
 Esther J. McNeil, ANC, N760025.  
 Anne Mears, ANC, N751370.  
 Ray L. Miller, MC, O349566.  
 Ouida R. Mire, ANC, N735449.  
 Margaret B. Mizelle, ANC, N742338.  
 Myrtle M. Musch, ANC, N731752.  
 Lottie M. Myers, ANC, N735911.  
 Ida F. Neal, ANC, N727607.  
 Lois M. Nemes, ANC, N727005.  
 Bertha M. Nichols, ANC, N758178.  
 Mary J. Orbin, ANC, N760319.  
 Clara E. Orsini, ANC, N737149.  
 Marsclene A. B. Perreault, ANC, N775196.  
 Jane C. Pesci, ANC, N759089.  
 Elna C. Petersen, WMSC, R2357.  
 Henrietta H. Pfeffer, ANC, N759256.  
 Kathleen W. Phillips, ANC, N771325.  
 Ida G. Price, ANC, N743624.  
 Marie M. Quass, ANC, N775355.  
 Breda A. Quigley, ANC, N797574.  
 Caroline L. Rabenold, ANC, N724225.  
 Katherine A. Ralls, ANC, N776130.  
 Flora M. Rand, WMSC, M711.  
 Elizabeth F. Rapp, ANC, N724559.  
 Mary M. Robertson, ANC, N726076.  
 Edith C. Roderick, ANC, N725842.  
 Louise C. Rosasco, ANC, N771656.  
 Esther K. Rosenberg, WMSC, R756.  
 Etta L. Ryden, ANC, N761222.  
 Leontina M. Savage, ANC, N732176.

Charlotte M. Scheel, ANC, N775865.  
 June B. Schultz, ANC, N732067.  
 Evelyn E. Schwind, ANC, N730923.  
 Doris L. Shaw, ANC, N734924.  
 Mary A. Shea, ANC, N722734.  
 Dorothy R. Shrier, ANC, N779189.  
 Rita M. Siebert, ANC, N733093.  
 Virginia R. Sneed, ANC, N725111.  
 Lilla B. Snider, ANC, N736086.  
 Ethel M. Snoddy, ANC, N784883.  
 Ward A. Soanes, MC, O991761.  
 Martha M. Staelens, ANC, N726443.  
 Dora J. Stohl, ANC, N741501.  
 Martha E. Stokes, ANC, N797275.  
 Katrine F. Stone, ANC, N703196.  
 Violet G. Stringfellow, ANC, N759472.  
 Annie L. Thacker, WMSC.  
 Sadye T. Travers, ANC, N767162.  
 Berta A. Tucker, ANC, N764007.  
 Stacia V. Urban, ANC, N722570.  
 Rose F. Varhalla, ANC, N732276.  
 Ada M. Walker, ANC, N760691.  
 Opal Walker, ANC, N723496.  
 Margaret M. Walsh, ANC, N737484.  
 Vera G. Ward, ANC, N727092.  
 Aquillya M. Ware, ANC, N793798.  
 Helen M. Warner, ANC, N755653.  
 Alice E. Werner, ANC, N774405.  
 Wilma L. West, WMSC, J100072.  
 Claire A. Wilson, ANC, N764360.  
 Harriet E. Winkler, ANC, N775635.  
 Donald J. Winslow, MC, O419510.  
 Harriet E. Wykowski, ANC, N774128.  
 Mildred M. Yardley, ANC, N722265.  
 Irene L. Yeik, ANC, N728404.  
 Henry L. Zak, DC.  
 Margaret C. Zane, ANC, N744094.  
 Neta A. Zinn, ANC, N771096.  
 Winifred R. Zirkle, ANC, N745277.

#### To be first lieutenants

Edwin F. Ammerman, JAGC, O987056.  
 Madge Ashton, WMSC, M2770.  
 Anna B. Astrosky, ANC, N778425.  
 Willie V. Bailey, ANC, N764921.  
 Eugene B. Becker, MC.  
 Esther R. Bichler, ANC, N795896.  
 Mary L. Blaney, ANC, N794703.  
 Goldie M. Bowman, ANC, N799469.  
 Mozelle R. Breedlove, ANC, N765247.  
 Cabell F. Cobbs, JAGC, O984210.  
 Marion E. Cook, WMSC, R2480.  
 Maryelle Dodds, WMSC, J100052.  
 Howard M. Duffield, DC, O963584.  
 Dorothy J. Eck, ANC, N762820.  
 Doris I. Foster, ANC, N777378.  
 George E. Fuller, Jr., DC, O1725082.  
 Ruth I. Graham, ANC, N765749.  
 Richard M. Hall, DC, O833093.  
 Harriett F. Hansen, ANC, N773829.  
 Joseph A. Hawkins, MC, O982342.  
 Eugene Hickey, DC.  
 William A. Horgor, JAGC, O991666.  
 Lethie L. Kay, ANC, N780086.  
 Harold H. Kelsey, DC, O1718826.  
 Helen M. Killien, ANC, N799522.  
 Irene Lyon, ANC, N762866.  
 Margaret M. Montesanti, ANC, N762572.  
 Samuel C. Mooney, DC, O1765205.  
 Jean Nuss, ANC, N774362.  
 Mary A. O'Brien, ANC, N794306.  
 Eileen D. O'Dwyer, ANC, N768735.  
 Doris I. Pillsbury, ANC, N754907.  
 Genevieve R. Potochnik, ANC, N774279.  
 Bruce A. Raymond, MC, O971622.  
 Evelyn Revels, ANC, N765693.  
 Fred Schneider, DC, O1755132.  
 Mary D. Slabe, ANC, N762648.  
 John A. Smith, Jr., JAGC, O373679.  
 Mary M. Staron, ANC, N770148.  
 Alice M. Strong, WMSC, R2254.  
 Margaret E. Wendland, ANC, N784981.  
 Margaret E. Weydert, ANC, AN795564.  
 Geraldine L. Whitford, ANC, N793873.

#### To be second lieutenants

Florence M. Bearden, WMSC, J100094.  
 Joanne E. Camp, ANC, N804236.  
 Charlotte N. Davis, WMSC, R2555.  
 Patricia J. Evanhoe, WMSC, R2553.  
 Marilynne E. Faust, WMSC, R2558.  
 Selma E. Kaplan, WMSC, R2564.

Kathryn A. Koenig, ANC, N804497.  
 Mary E. Mack, ANC, N792952.  
 Catherine F. McLarty, WMSC, J100091.  
 Barbara M. Priceman, WMSC, R2552.  
 Ruth A. Rickers, WMSC, J100089.  
 Margaret E. Waple, WMSC, J100098.

The following-named person for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship, and subject to physical qualification:

George E. Omer, Jr., O2002511.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Robert W. Adenbaum.  
 William D. Barrus, O2209439.  
 Raymond B. Cromwell, Jr., O2204947.  
 James H. Duke, Jr., O2207640.  
 William R. Fouch, O2209166.  
 Daniel L. French, O2200201.  
 David A. Harpman, O2207715.  
 Joseph N. Fearin, Jr., O1061971.  
 Richard A. Howells, O970316.  
 Robert B. Kane, O2209303.  
 Kenneth W. Larson, O141495.  
 Frederick D. Limmer, O2200583.  
 Patrick J. McDonnell, O2210321.  
 Michael M. Mryczko, O988476.  
 John A. Stevenson, O2205663.  
 Robert B. Sumner, O2207571.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Ernest J. Dickinson, O2207711.  
 Richard L. Ehni, O2200189.  
 Bernard T. Hassett, O2200661.  
 Otto Kerr, Jr., O2205349.  
 Theodore G. Parkman, Jr., O966921.  
 Joseph H. Poole, O2204492.  
 Hollis H. Whitaker, O2209465.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1951, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Ralph J. Aniol, Jr.	James A. Michienzi,
James W. Baldwin, Jr.	O2211212
Harold B. Birch	John A. Mitchell
Lawrence E. Birdsong	Charles B. Moore
James A. Bontadelli	David S. Moore
William C. Bridges	Bob P. Oglesby, Jr.
Harry W. Brown	Wiley W. Osborne
William R. Cashman,	Harry M. Owen
Jr., O971417	James H. Pierce
Richard M. Clohecy	David C. Pinkham,
Anthony J. Deskins	O955189
Rodney Fitzgibbon	John D. Pratt,
William H. Flanders	O2209386
James P. Flood,	James B. Reed
O2211220	Charles J. Steigleder
Clarence E. Ford	James R. Tommey
Wendell L. Harris,	Arthur N. Tuttle, Jr.
O2211401	Dominic Varella,
Earl F. Harvey	O978831
Robert J. Holley	Billy G. Walker,
Robert W. Huntzinger	O2207011
Michael J. Ingrassia	Douglas M. Watland,
Warren E. Johnson	O2209575
Ralph E. Martin	Harry A. Yoder
Gerald E. McGlynn,	
Jr.	

#### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

#### To be majors, USAF (medical)

Arthur J. Katzberg, O482310.  
 Gordon H. Rhoades, AO277553.

#### To be captains, USAF (medical)

Kenneth W. Clement, O1746021.  
 James F. DeLoach, O1736633.  
 Robert C. Doherty, AO1906863.  
 Bernard E. Flaherty, AO1745326.  
 Robert J. Kurth, AO1766746.

#### To be captains, USAF (dental)

William H. Book, AO401408.  
 Henry I. Copeland, Jr., AO966807.  
 Maurice L. Parrish, AO1775019.  
 Loren H. Schwarzrock, AO1700871.

#### To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Charles A. Berry.  
 Donald P. Ford, AO2213605.  
 Samuel L. Gabby, Jr., AO2212535.  
 Billy N. Gray, AO670884.  
 Thomas M. Holcomb, AO970162.  
 Ronald W. Krumbach, AO2212400.  
 John R. Welmer, AO2212322.

#### To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Ernest M. Baird II, AO1864300.  
 Clarence M. McCall, Jr., AO1906199.  
 Owen J. Morrissey, AO1545132.  
 Edwin W. Owen, AO870020.  
 Russell J. Salentine, AO1906198.  
 Vincent A. Segreto, AO966302.

The following-named distinguished officer candidates for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

#### To be second lieutenants

Jack A. Hayes, AO1910602.  
 Walfred J. Larson, AO591376.  
 Edward C. Lassiter, AO1910620.  
 Frank H. Rave, AO1910642.  
 Pasquale Torrace, AO1910663.  
 Miles S. Washington, Jr., AO1910672.

The following-named distinguished officer candidate for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 301, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

#### To be second lieutenant

Anita M. Bellizzi, AL1910565.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadet for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

#### To be second lieutenant

Lansing G. Scofield

The following-named person for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

#### To be second lieutenant

George R. Loftis, 532966 USN.



# CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of March 26), 1951:

## IN THE ARMY

### APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. James Clyde Fy, O15023, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), to be brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States.

### TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

#### To be brigadier generals

Col. Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, O4731, United States Army.

Col. Anthony Joseph Drexel Biddle, Jr., O544174.

#### AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

The officer named herein for appointment in the Air National Guard of the United States of the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

#### To be major general

Brig. Gen. Earl Thornton Ricks, AO395254, Arkansas Air National Guard, to date from March 7, 1951.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

#### To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A.

Brig. Gen. George Warren Mundy, 358A.

Brig. Gen. George Robert Acheson, 335A.

Brig. Gen. Edward Julius Timberlake, Jr., 603A.

Brig. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham, AO343889.

Brig. Gen. Edmund Clayton Lynch, 77A.

Brig. Gen. James Franklin Powell, 128A.

Brig. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., 294A.

Brig. Gen. Dan Clark Ogle, 602A.

#### To be brigadier generals

Col. George Ferrow Smith, 380A.

Col. Joe William Kelly, 612A.

Col. Russell J. Minty, 224A.

Col. James Ferguson, 1530A.

Col. Harold Hanson Twitchell, 19034A.

Col. Gilbert Hayden, 218A.

Col. Richard August Grussendorf, 543A.

Col. Clyde Lemuel Brothers, 19027A.

Col. Wycliffe Eugene Steele, 491A.

Col. Ralph Orville Brownfield, 399A.

Col. Robert Oswald Cork, 523A.

Col. Leighton Ira Davis, 1111A.

#### UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

### APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

#### To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, 33A, United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Fifth Air Force, Far East Air Forces, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A, United States Air Force, to be deputy commanding general, Far East Air Forces, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Robert Wells Harper, 53A, United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Air Training Command, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A, United States Air Force, to be commander, Military Air Transport Service, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

Maj. Gen. Richard Emmel Nugent, 57A, United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, Headquarters, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant

general, with date of rank from date of appointment.

### PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Kemper Warren Baker et al. and the nominations of Edward August Dvorak et al. for promotion in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 27, 1951, and appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Kemper Warren Baker, the first name appearing in the first group mentioned, and which is shown on page 2928, and ending with the name of Inez Velma McDonald, which appears on page 2935, being the last name of the second group mentioned.

### IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. William M. Callaghan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. O. L. Fontaine, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Mangum, Okla., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we pause at this the beginning of an important day's work to ask Thy blessing upon all that is done here that Thou mayest use it for the betterment of all mankind.

Save this moment from being merely the perfunctory performance of a routine matter but may it be a time when we genuinely recognize Thy presence and offer ourselves to Thy leadership.

For Thy wisdom, O God, is far above that of our own. Thy law is above all our laws, and Thy truth alone is sufficient to lead us in these difficult times. And only Thy love can guide us wisely. Save us, O God, from even the slightest relinquishing the hope of a better world and tomorrow, a world built upon the proposition of the inherent dignity of every individual. Despite every difficulty, every disappointment, set our hearts steadfastly toward the accomplishment of this hope, though it take a thousand years.

Make us to know that unless we stand for something we may fall for everything.

Bless, O God, these leaders of this great country of ours—to the end that this country under God, may have a new birth of freedom, justice, and love. In the name of Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I inquire if the Speaker would agree that the House would take a recess of 2 hours. I make this request because of the tragic situation that prevails in the world. I should like, if I could, to have a Republican conference. If the Speaker will

permit me to make that request, I shall do so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say that that is a very unusual request. The Chair does not think it has ever been made in the history of the Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, these are very unusual conditions.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is perfectly willing to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts on that point. However, there is an amendment coming up to the bill that the Chair thinks will take some hours, in all probability.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Chair understands that in accordance with his policies and the policies I have previously agreed with, too, we desire all our membership to be on the floor when these various bills are being read for amendment. Because of the tremendous importance of the situation in the world today, I should like to submit that request, but, of course, I shall not insist on it if the Speaker is not agreeable to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts poses a very hard question for the Chair. For the moment the Chair thinks he will not entertain the request.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

### [Roll No. 27]

Allen, La.	Hébert	Powell
Armstrong	Kersten	Radwan
Blatnik	Mack, Ill.	Scott, Hardie
Boykin	Martin, Iowa	Sieminski
Buchanan	Miller, N. Y.	Tollefson
Celler	Murray, Wis.	Wildnall
Deane	O'Konski	Woodruff
Dingell	O'Neill	
Gillette	Phillips	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 408 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### 1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: On page 51 strike out lines 11 to 20, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps, and no person shall be ordered to active duty pursuant to section 6 (d) (1), after July 1, 1954. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior thereto shall, not more than 6 months after that date be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a Reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be able to explain to the Committee, so that they can clearly understand it, what the Elston amendment does, and I hope I will not be forced to use more than 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the bill there is a termination date for induction for service, that is, the draft. Under the bill the draft only runs for a period of 3 years. The gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment to make the termination date for induction for training the same, making the length of time 3 years. Here is the fallacy of the gentleman's amendment at this time. In the first place we do not have any training program. No training program has yet been adopted. Consider what we would be doing. You would be saying that before a training program has ever been submitted to the Congress, and before the Congress has ever approved a training program, that whatever we do in the future can only be done for a period of 3 years. In other words, you are saying that something which will be created in the future can only live for a period of 3 years. I am frank to admit to the House that when the plan comes to the Congress it would be properly within the province of the committee to determine then how long the plan should be in force. But to adopt the amendment now, before the Congress has even approved a plan, is killing it before it is created. That would be the absurdity of adopting such an amendment.

The proper time to do it is when the Congress considers the plan.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Under the gentleman's amendment, and under the bill itself the Commission would be appointed by the President and the training corps would come into being immediately. Within 6 months the Commission must then submit a plan to the Congress. After the Congress has approved or rejected the plan, is there any provision in the bill for a review of the program thereafter, if the amendment which I have introduced is not adopted?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's question somewhat evades the issue involved in his amendment. There is a provision in the bill providing that every 6 months the Commission must report to the Congress as to the type and character of training.

Mr. Chairman, getting back to the gentleman's amendment. He proposes now to say that a plan which will be adopted in the future, a plan which has not yet been submitted, can only be adopted for a period of 3 years. Of course, it is inopportune to do that now. The time to do that and to put a termination on it is when the plan is laid before the committee and before Congress. I am frank to say that in all probability the Committee on Armed Services, in studying the plan, would write a termination date on the plan, but certainly some flexibility would be allowed to try it out for a reasonable period instead of so short a period as 3 years.

So I hope you will not do this now and that you will not say that before this is born, if you do create it, you can only create it for a period of 3 years.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the gentleman's amendment so worded that it would make it impossible for the Committee on Armed Services to change the date in the bill which they may later report?

Mr. VINSON. The Armed Services Committee would have to say notwithstanding any other law we fix the date, or else they would be bound by the 3-year limitation.

Mr. KEATING. But would not the Armed Services Committee have power to fix the date later than we fixed it in the bill?

Mr. VINSON. Of course the Armed Services Committee and the Congress could say 6 years; the Congress could say 5 years; the Congress could say 8 years when the plan comes before the Congress.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask the gentleman whether the gentleman agrees to some termination date?

Mr. VINSON. When the issue comes before the committee it is pertinent and proper that a termination date at that time be considered by the Congress. But do not say now, before you even create the plan, that when it is born you will knock it in the head 3 years from that date.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no Member of this body could offer a stronger argument against this bill than its own sponsor, the distinguished chairman of our committee. He said, "It is an inopportune time now to set a termination date." I say it is an inopportune time now to pass this legislation. Let us cross that bridge when we get to it. We can pass this legislation if and when it is needed.

There have been Members of this body on both sides of the aisle who have criticized the opponents of this measure as being hostile to the "brass" and the "braid." I want to say that the pictures of admirals and generals hang on my

wall, and I hold in my mind and heart the highest admiration, the deepest and fondest affection for many of them. Forever I shall be grateful to them for the great victories they have won. I do not believe in blind, subservient obedience. I will follow them when I think they are right and I will leave them when I think they are wrong. To refresh the memory of Members without trying to befog and becloud the issue and muddle your minds by saying that we are up here fighting the "brass" and the "braid," I want to read you what I said in this very spot on September 17, 1945, almost 6 years ago, just a little more than a month after VJ-day. That was the hour when the fathers and mothers and the people all over this country were clamoring, "Bring our boys home, not next year, next month, or next week, but brings them home now; fly them home." And I was one of only two or three Members of this House who was opposed by some of my Republican colleagues when I stood up and spoke against too quick demobilization. I want you to hear my remarks from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 7, page 8631:

We took 5 long years, gentlemen, to build up the mightiest war machine in the history of the world. About 12,000,000 men and women are scattered all over this universe—on every continent and on every sea. It has taken years to get them out there. Now, after four long years of war and after glorious victory over three of the mightiest, most determined, and most ruthless military powers the world has ever known, we stop fighting the Italians, the Germans, and the Japs and start fighting among ourselves and start kicking around the "brass hats" and the "gold braids" who, in spite of all their faults and shortcomings, have won important renown. Heaven knows that I have never claimed infallibility for any of our generals or admirals. No member of our committee has more violently opposed them at times. I know that they are not perfect, and that they have and will make mistakes. Nevertheless, it must be conceded that they are free from many of the pressures that elected officers are subject to and that they can, with sympathy and resoluteness, decide certain problems peculiar to their own field.

It does seem strange that only a few months ago when the fate of this Nation hung in the balance, when our very lives were at stake, that we were praising to the skies our generals and admirals. You know, I wonder how in the name of God, Leahy and Marshall, King and Arnold, Eisenhower and Devers, Bradley, Patch, Hodges, and Patton, Simpson, Brereton, Doolittle, and Chennault, Spaatz and Kenney, Eaker and Somervell—I wonder how in the name of heaven Nimitz or his commanders in the Pacific, Mitscher, whom we will soon see in this House, along with Admirals Halsey, Kincaid, and Spruance—I wonder how in the world these gallant marines under Vandegrift, and the forces under gallant and colorful MacArthur, able Kreuger—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the membership of this House



for their kindness, consideration, and generosity, which goes to prove that after all here in America, much as we might violently differ not only between parties but among ourselves on both this side and that side of the aisle, every American has the opportunity to stand up and speak his mind. I continue to quote from my speech on this floor on September 17, 1945:

I wonder how in the world these gallant marines under Vandegrift, and the forces under gallant and colorful MacArthur, able Krueger, suffering Wainwright, patient Elchberger, ever won this war without these parlor generals and pink tea strategists back home who are now willing, after they have saved our necks, to kick them all over hell's half acre. But it is only natural after a war for everybody to want to come home. And it is also natural to cuss the generals and admirals. They expect it. And I say this as one who I do not think has ever kow-towed to them or been subservient in the least—I know that the generals and admirals make mistakes; even Members of Congress do sometimes, because all of us are human.

I do want to say that I think the Army was not prepared for demobilization as it was for war. Why should it be? The primary interest, the paramount duty of the leaders of our Armed Forces on land and sea and in the air was to win this war. It was not to think, plan, dream, and waste time about setting up machinery to demobilize. It was to win the war quickly and stop the bloodshed immediately. This they have done. Now then, we are so darned impatient, we are not willing to give them a few weeks to adjust themselves and find out where they really are. MacArthur has to take inventory.

Mr. Chairman, I could continue that speech, but, oh, we have reached the sad, tragic hour when you have got to fire Acheson or fire MacArthur. You who have been criticizing us for differing with the admirals and generals, what are you going to say today when instead of firing Dean Acheson, who refuses to turn his back on Alger Hiss, a convicted perjurer, a traitor now in prison, Harry Truman refuses to turn his back on Dean Acheson but fires Douglas MacArthur, one of the world's greatest generals of all time. Oh, where are you defenders of the brass and the braid?

Where are you? Where do you stand? Shall we hear any voices on the floor of this House in this tragic hour? You can have your Acheson. He, as well as MacArthur, will be remembered, but for different reasons. You know, Abraham Lincoln once said:

I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to do right. I will follow any man as long as he does right, but when he goes wrong, then we part.

But that is the difference between Honest Abe and Dean Acheson and little Harry from Lamar.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no delusions that I am going to bring you from your seats during the 5 minutes I propose to speak on this amendment. On the other hand, I do propose to speak 5 minutes on the amendment.

I stated here last week that this is a matter affecting the security and defense of the country and should be considered

calmly and dispassionately. At that time I expressed regret that every controversial issue which was then current in the country had been brought into the debate on a question which should be calmly and deliberately considered without partisanship. We now see that the very latest and the hottest controversial issue gets into the debate before we barely get started.

Let us talk about the bill and the amendment. I still have no delusions but what throughout the day and for days to come we will be diverted from the bill by highly controversial matters, which I insist do not determine how any Member should vote on this highly important bill in the interest of national defense, as I see it—maybe you see it the other way—but it is certainly one that should be considered without these controversial issues.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio strikes out the language on page 51 of the bill from line 11 to line 20. That language reads:

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person inducted into the National Security Training Corps prior to the adoption of said concurrent resolution shall, not more than 6 months following the adoption thereof, be released from training in such corps, but shall not be relieved from his obligation to serve in a Reserve component as provided in section 4 (d) (3) of this title.

The gentleman's amendment would substitute for that language a provision that no one should be inducted into the National Security Training Corps subsequent to July 1, 1954. I submit that the committee has brought you here a provision leaving the duration of the induction into the National Security Training Corps in the hands of a majority of the Congress, not subject to veto by the President, because, as a concurrent resolution, it would not go to the President. Conceivably, Congress could terminate it prior to July 1, 1954, not that I think that would be done, but to illustrate to you the fact, under the provision that the committee has brought you, Congress has complete control as to how long the program shall continue. I believe, and it is evident, that the provision we have here is preferable to that of the gentleman from Ohio.

I submit further that even though the Commission should be appointed immediately upon the approval of this bill and secure prompt confirmation, that the question of the 6 months would be involved, so no matter how quickly the National Security Training Corps would go into operation, by July 1, 1954, we would not have had an opportunity to see whether the plan works or whether it is acceptable to the American people. You are going to terminate it on the date of the termination of the draft. Of course, it is conceivable, even though this may be used as an argument against my position, that the National Security Corps inductions would not begin before July 1, 1954, because, by the provisions of the bill itself, no one goes

into the National Security Training Corps until such time as the President by Executive order or the Congress by concurrent resolution finds that inductions for service under 19 are no longer required in the national interest, so that it either provides an inadequate period for test to determine whether the program is acceptable and workable or it provides that it shall never go into effect.

I submit that the provision in the bill is the proper provision; that it retains control in the hands of a majority of the Congress without interference of the President by way of veto which might require a two-thirds vote to overcome.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Since the bill puts all of the persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps into a reserve program, with a total service of 6 years, is there any reason that the gentleman knows of why the entire matter should not be reviewed in a little more than 3 years from the present time?

Mr. KILDAY. As to the extension of the existing law, I agree that there should be a termination date; there has always been. In the 1940 act, and all through the various extensions up until the 1948 act, each contained, of course, a termination date. As to the draft for service, I agree, but if you are going to start with a long-range program, you ought not have it appear as if boys in the 3-year-age brackets, during three particular ages, are subject to the bill, and that the others are not. You should have it on a basis where, on a long-range basis, each boy should know what was required of him and not be terminated in 3 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there was a meeting this morning of the Republican leadership of the House and the Senate. As a result of that meeting this statement was given out to the public:

(1) That the whole question of the conduct of foreign and military policy be investigated by the Congress in the light of latest tragic developments;

(2) That the Congress should have the complete views of General MacArthur and he should be invited to return for that purpose forthwith.

In addition, the question of possible impeachments was discussed.

As a result of this agreement Senator WHERRY will introduce in the Senate, and I have introduced in the House, a resolution calling for a joint session of the House and the Senate for the purpose of hearing the distinguished general.

I may say that I have communicated with the office of General MacArthur in Tokyo, and I am authorized to say that General MacArthur would be delighted to have an invitation from the House and the Senate to speak at a joint session. He would consider it a great honor. If that invitation is given, he can be here in about 3 weeks.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman should modify his first proposal to mean an investigation of the State Department, I think he might go forward in the feeling of probable success.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That would naturally go with it.

I should like to make one more statement: The Members will recall that I was hopeful we might have a recess for 2 hours in order that we could have a Republican conference in which we could discuss these latest developments. That request was not granted. May I say, however, that I think the Speaker acted wholly within his province when he did not entertain that request, I know it was neither personal or partisan because I can understand how it might lead to abuses. I am not finding any fault, but I am giving notice that following the adjournment of the House today there will be a meeting of the Republican Members of the House in this Chamber.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a happy position in which I find myself to feel constantly required to appear in opposition to some of the attitudes and proposals of some of my own very close friends on the minority side who are members of this committee. However, my feelings on this subject are so deep that I feel I have no other course. I should not like the impression to be created with the minority Members of the Committee of the Whole that the pending amendment has the support of all the minority members of the Committee on Armed Services.

Whatever the purpose behind this amendment may be, which I shall not attempt to characterize, the effect of it is to kill universal military training before it ever starts. In passing upon this amendment I urge that we all have in mind just what the purpose of a program of universal military training is and how important it is that the machinery be started now for its commencement in order that the military may begin to make its plans with respect to dealing with its own responsibility in our national defense.

It is expected that after the universal military training program has been in operation for a reasonably short period of time it will not only be possible for the military to release reservists who are now involuntarily on active duty but it will be possible for the military to reduce the size of the standing military establishment below the figure of approximately 3,500,000 men.

So, if the effect of this amendment is as I say, that it will stop universal military training before it ever starts, then we can expect the prospect of continuing the draft of young men for military service far beyond 1954, unless world conditions improve tremendously, and the prospect of improvement is not at all bright, as I am sure all of you will agree.

If this amendment carried a time limit within reasonable limitations which

would give the program of universal military training an opportunity to be put into operation and tested to determine whether or not the American people want that kind of system, none of those who favor the system would resist it. But the time which has been fixed by the gentleman's amendment is so very brief, that we not only make it impossible to give universal military training a fair trial, but we make it impossible for the military to make their plans for the future.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. May I state to the gentleman in the first place he is entirely wrong in his assumption that the effect of this amendment is to kill universal military training. Certainly that is not the intention of the author of the amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. That may not be the intention of the author of the amendment, but that is the effect of the amendment. Under the bill, if the Congress accepts the bill as it is now written, and under the most optimistic circumstances universal military training could not possibly get started within a year or a year and a half. Consequently, under the gentleman's amendment, universal military training could not operate for more than a year. It would take 6 months for the commission to be appointed and organized and make its plans, and it would take an indefinite period of time for the Congress to act upon the plan. After Congress has acted on the plan, the military must have some time to make preparations to receive these boys and house them and train them and construct facilities for them. Therefore, I say, under the most optimistic circumstances you could not operate UMT for more than a year.

Mr. ELSTON. Does not the gentleman realize that the effect of the amendment, instead of doing as indicated, actually does nothing more than to require a congressional review of the UMT program after it has been in operation for perhaps a year? Is there any reason why the Congress of the United States, the duly-elected representatives of the people should not sit down and calmly review the program in the light of conditions as they exist at that time? Certainly no future Congress is going to be bound by the actions of this Congress.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further to the gentleman. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the provision in this bill which permits the Congress, the representatives of the people, to review this program at any time, and it can stop inductions into the UMT on the day after inductions start if it wants to. Therefore, the gentleman's argument that his amendment is needed to permit the Congress to review UMT is completely baseless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I am also sorry to have to oppose this amendment. But I want

to take these few moments to present to you my view. The argument of my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, the ranking member of our committee and a very good friend of mine, is the very argument that you should keep in mind when you vote on this amendment. If you carry out the necessary lessons to be learned from the too rapid demobilization in 1945 and 1946 I believe you will inevitably come to the opinion that if America is to have a sound, long-range security policy, we must have some form of universal military training.

Two times in my lifetime I have seen America build itself up to the pinnacle of military strength and to the pinnacle of world leadership. Twice we just let a'l our strength drift and disintegrate. In this small explosive world I firmly believe we must have some long-range policy for our national protection. I cannot sit still and allow an amendment to go to the House without protesting against it, since it would have the effect, as our chairman said, of killing the proposition before it is ever born.

I would like to have a UMT program continue for at least 6 years so that we can get a fair sample of what it will do in building up a sound security program, which will filter into the Armed Forces of the United States men who are trained and who will be ready for any emergency.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Does not the gentleman believe it would be a good thing for the Congress periodically to look into these matters? And does not the gentleman believe that in 1954 the succeeding Congress, of which the gentleman from California may be a member, should have the right to come in and take a look at it? Maybe they will say it is all right and they will take it again and possibly they may say it is not working and let us stop it.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is a good thing to review those things, but if you review them too often and too quickly before they are tried, they will never have a chance to prove themselves. I want to point out to you, sir, that the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States imposed certain restraints on the Government and on future Congresses, because they thought that the Congress might do things which would interfere with the liberties of the people or would take rash and precipitous action.

Mr. ARENDS. And the big thing that they put in in a legislative way was that you and I have to go to the people every 2 years and report back to our people before we can return to this body.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is right.

Mr. ARENDS. The actions of the duly-elected representatives of the people are reviewed every 2 years, and the same thing should apply here.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is not comparable at all, because this policy that we are trying to inaugurate will take several years to develop and prove itself or disprove itself. Of course, if you do not look at the world as I look at it, I believe that the world is small and explosive and in a dangerous situation; if you



do not realize that the people that we gambled on as being our allies, who twice held the enemy at bay, are gradually losing their strength and the time and the space that we gambled on no longer exist, then you will come to a different conclusion. Therefore, I want to do all I can to give this idea a chance which some of our great leaders that my colleague from Missouri emphasized as being the one proper solution of our security problems. That will then have a chance to live and prove itself, and I think if it has that chance it will show to us that it is the one way that we can protect the future of America. We are the trustees for the future, and that is why I am so anxious to have this plan tried out.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what we do about the review of UMT must, of course, depend largely upon what we do about the number of people we take in. It is my purpose a little later in the evening to offer an amendment that will authorize the enlistment in the American Army of the nationals of other countries, specifically including those of Germany and Japan. I do not suggest that these foreign nationals shall be in lieu of the induction of all American boys, because I recognize we will still have to have American boys, but I offer it with the idea that every time we can get someone else to help us, we make ourselves that much stronger; with the idea not that America will shirk her share of making the world strong, but with the idea that it is proper for America to call upon everyone who will to share in making the world strong against aggression.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has spoken about using anyone who wants to help us; what is the gentleman's idea about allowing the forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to help us in Asia?

Mr. POAGE. I am in favor of enlisting any man who can render service to the United States and carry on our struggle against aggressors anywhere. I am in favor of enlisting men in Asia and in Europe, and I am in favor of putting them in the American Army where we will know that we can control them, not where they will be maintained at the expense of the United States, but under some questionable authority, but where they will be under American control as well; where we can use them and direct them; and I am in favor of bringing them in voluntarily where they can serve as volunteers in the American Army. Certainly they will not replace Americans man for man, but maybe three of them will replace one American. If we can replace a hundred thousand American boys with three hundred thousand foreigners, it would be a sound thing.

Now, do not tell me that you are afraid to hire somebody to do a job for the United States. Wherein is it so moral for you to go out and draft some American boy who does not want in the Army—

and I am going to vote to continue the draft because I can see no alternative—but where is it so right to go out and grab some American boy by the nape of the neck and so wrong to go out and hire a German national or a Japanese national or a national of some other country who wants to have the job and desires it? What is it that makes it so moral in the one case and so immoral in the other?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. How would the gentleman feel about including certain types of prisoners who would like to volunteer? There are thousands of men in our State and Federal prisons who would volunteer for military service and if the authorities were permitted to use discretion in accepting them under certain conditions, it would seem to me most worthy of consideration. It would furnish manpower; it would afford opportunity for prisoner rehabilitation.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will pardon me, I am only talking here of the matter of authorizing the enlistment of foreign nationals; I am not trying to extend this proposal and accumulate any more opposition than necessary. The gentleman may have a good idea but it is not what I shall offer in my amendment. I am interested at this time only in getting the policy established of employing foreigners who would like to serve in the United States Army. I am simply asking that you give them a chance where they request it so that we can replace some of these boys whom we are going to have to draft.

Even with this amendment we are still going to have to have the draft; do not ever get me wrong; we are still going to have to draft our own boys, but if we can relieve some American boys by spending more American dollars then I am in favor of spending the dollars, especially if we can save American lives by doing it; and I am going to offer an amendment to that effect shortly. I do not propose to bribe these foreigners by any offer of American citizenship. In fact my amendment will specifically provide that such foreign nationals as accept our offer of good pay, food, and quarters, shall acquire no preference toward American citizenship and shall not be entitled to veterans' benefits. I simply offer them a job if they want it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. Despite what our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia, has said against this amendment, despite what other Members of the majority and minority side have said against it, I am convinced that his amendment is a meritorious one. I think the Congress not only would want to, but I think they should be required to take a look-see at this proposition some 3 years from now when the Eighty-third Congress will be in session. Despite what you or I think about it, it is going to be one of the major factors in the next election. Soon there will be an intervening election which will afford the Congress and the Nation an opportunity to get a line

on what the people think about this proposition. I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues support this amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it will probably be late in the afternoon before I shall have an opportunity to present what I consider to be the most important question before the country and before the people who are affected by the presently pending draft bill, a question that is of more importance than any other in this entire debate. I refer to a proposal I am going to make that anyone who is drafted into the armed services or who comes in under UMT or any other measure which we pass in the Congress shall be given the privilege of the vote.

I submit that this question is bound up with everything which our Constitution holds dear to us. If these boys of 18 you are going to draft are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote. We went over that whole question during World War II. There were a lot of people who on the one hand were in favor of bringing these boys into the armed services, yet on the other hand deliberately prevented them from casting their ballots, from entering into participation of running this Government, who would deny them their constitutional prerogatives in accordance with the law of the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman, if a man is old enough and qualified to fight, he ought to have the privilege of voting, but with the Constitution as it is now, how can this Congress legislate on that subject?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This Congress has great power.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Again I agree with the gentleman, but we do not use it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Here is an opportunity to use it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How, under the constitutional provisions as they now exist, can we do it?

We passed the soldier vote bill in World War II. That was constitutional.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Let us give these boys a chance to vote now. I hate to see them being shanghaied into the services without being given this constitutional right to vote. I expect to go along with the proper defense of our country, I expect to go right down the line in doing everything we can to make a strong Army.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I suggest that the gentleman read the letter written by Lord Macaulay to Mr. Randall, of New York, of May 23, 1857.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If he is a Britisher he does not reflect my attitude at home. I represent the Americans in my district, not Great Britain or any other foreign power. I represent



the Americans of the Thirty-seventh Congressional District of New York and I expect to fight in their interests on the floor of this House and to vote to the very best of my ability for Americanism right on down the line.

That is why I am here today to plead with the members of the committee, with the Chairman, and everyone else, that when my amendment comes before the House giving these boys the opportunity to vote, regardless of age, the young men who are brought in under this proposed draft bill, my amendment will not be declared out of order. This amendment will be ruled to be germane to the bill, because I know of nothing more germane or nothing more appropriate at this time than giving these boys of 18 that you are drafting into the Armed Forces of the United States, and bringing in under universal military conscription, the opportunity of voting. I know of nothing which would be more appropriate than this House agreeing to my amendment, which I shall present later in the day. I sincerely hope it will be adopted.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. What would the gentleman do with the boys in ROTC and in high school?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If they are old enough to fight they are old enough to vote.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the suspense of waiting for the gentleman's proposal will be trying.

This bill of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. Chairman, was put to sea in the midst of a storm which is this morning at its peak. I confess that I, too, am possessed of that feeling of indignation expressed by so many throughout the country today. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to permit my passion, my indignation, over what has taken place to influence my judgment against what I know in my own heart to be a wise proposal. The Committee on Armed Services has fought a gallant fight. The committee is symbolic, in a sense, of the strength and of the will of this country to contend with an active and hostile force operating all over the world.

I had intended making an appeal directed to my friends who take an independent attitude on public questions, having no regard whatever for the aisle that divides the minority and the majority, on behalf of the UMT provisions of the bill. But that provision, under the assault made by the opposition, has been so modified that it is at the present time hardly more than an empty shell. However, I know that the psychological effect of turning down this committee even on that synthetic proposal would be bad, bad not only here at home but bad all over the world.

Our military people, referred to as "the brass," are taking a terrible beating in this debate, a beating wholly unde-

served. I am not particularly interested in the so-called brass, but, Mr. Chairman, in a time of stress as that in which we now live, if there are those upon whom we can safely depend for guidance, for leadership, and for direction in the struggle that confronts us and the struggle in which we are engaged, it is our professional military people. Mr. Chairman, they cannot get the results that the country expects and that the country must have if it is to survive, if they are to have no part in the making of the program under which they operate. If the politician is to write the program, if the politician is to lay out the campaign, then our professional fighting men in the Armed Forces and the young men of the country under their command will be put at a great disadvantage.

Mr. Chairman, I do make this appeal to those who, as I say, ordinarily take an independent attitude, let us not make the mistake of throwing down this great committee sponsoring the legislation now before this body. They are entitled to better support than we are giving them at this moment, and I do appeal to you to stand by the committee in the position which it now takes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to consume the time of the Committee any longer than is necessary, but I think before we go to a vote on this matter—because there have been so many interruptions in the course of the debate—we should at least fully understand exactly what this amendment does.

Mr. Chairman, I have profound respect for the ability of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] as a lawyer, as a jurist, and as a legislator, and I think he knows what he is doing in presenting this amendment. I have been for UMT and supported it for a period of over 30 years; and I naturally have followed the course of the arguments, pro and con, in reference to this matter. This amendment will call for another vote on UMT by the Congress July 1, 1954.

If we put through the bill as it has come before us, it means this: We will vote on it during the course of this week and pass it. Then later—under the terms of this bill, 6 months from now—we will bring up the question of a report from the Commission, and again the Congress will vote, within 6 months, on universal military training. Then if it goes through at that time and if Congress approves it, we are confronted with the question of getting money in the year 1952 for universal military training to be started during the fiscal year 1952-53. Then, within 6 months after we start the program, the Commission which we create in this bill is required by the terms of the bill to come back to the Congress and give us another report on how the program is operating, and the Congress again will have an opportunity to go into the matter and investigate how it is operating.

Then, in spite of all those checks and investigations, and our timidity to be sure that nothing wrong happens; in

spite of all of that, under the terms of the Elston amendment, although the program cannot be established before the fiscal year 1952-53, in 1954, the following year, we go through the same procedure again. In other words, we have one clear year during which universal military training can proceed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that the bill bringing in the plan for universal military training could contain an amendment taking out the 1954 date, or extending it, so that we would not have to go through the same procedure again?

Mr. BROOKS. The Congress can do what it wants. The Congress can hear this question every 6 months if it wants to, or every 10 years. The Congress can do whatever it wants. But under the terms of the bill, I tell you now that universal military training will have one clear year of operation before we will then hear the matter again. We will be scampering around every solid month from the time we vote on this bill today to the very time when the gentleman's amendment takes effect to investigate and reinvestigate the operation of a program that is not even fairly commenced.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Following up the observation of my friend from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and knowing the legislative processes and procedures here, the logical course to follow is to wait until the Commission's recommendations come up and the committee considers them. That is when the whole primary question will be before the committee and the House. The very argument the gentleman advances redounds against him. This amendment should be defeated now. The proper time to consider it is when the bill is before us.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much for his very fine remarks.

May I say in conclusion that if you were a reckless driver in an automobile running down the street and you hit somebody head-on you would kill him, but if you were that same reckless driver and sideswiped him you would spin him around in the ditch and maybe break his neck, but you would kill him just as dead. The Elston amendment is going to kill this bill by sideswiping it just as dead as if we repealed it by a special clause.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Elston amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDELL].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Since the Constitution provides that no appropriation of money for the military forces can last for longer than 2 years, does not the gentleman think we are not out of line in attempting to review all kinds of conscription every 3 years?

Mr. WERDEL. Yes, and I thank the gentleman for calling our attention to that provision. I am particularly concerned with the assumption that there is no particular difference between the desires of the gentleman from Ohio and those as expressed by the gentleman from New York. Of course, the Congress can reconsider these subjects whenever it wants to. The effect of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is that we must renew it or it discontinues. We do not have a situation such as exists in England where they can experiment with these ideologies. We are under a written Constitution, whereas they have an unwritten constitution, and a legislative body controlled by one house. They can experiment and throw it off if they do not like it. They owe allegiance to a king, and we owe allegiance to the meaning of a written Constitution. We have a two-house legislature and if we pass a universal military training bill, it will require a majority of both Houses to repeal it, that is if we pass it for all time to come.

Mr. Chairman, that brings me to the point which I expressed last week. I agree this morning with most of you that we must immediately extend the Draft Act. There is disagreement among many of us as to what the form of universal military training should be. I abhor any such authority above the State level in peacetime. I will never support any other bill in my present frame of mind. I ask you, however, to assume that the desires of many of the Members of the House and the Military Establishment be accomplished and that we set up universal military training at the Washington level. I ask you to assume the bill gives them the power to drain off manpower from the States, so far as the State defense agencies are concerned, the National Guard. Then I ask you to assume that 10 years from now there is a plan in Washington for action to which some of us disagree. Then the burden will be on those of us from the West or the North or the South or the East or the rural areas to overcome the political pressure in the metropolitan areas, or the burden will be on those from the metropolitan areas, as the case may be, to overcome the pressure from the rural areas in the other body.

This is an important problem. This problem can shift with the shifting contingencies affecting national defense. It changes with each hour and each year. I think the gentleman's amendment is well worth our support. Certainly there is nothing wrong with saying that the Congress, and that each man from each area, has to express himself in regard to the effectiveness of universal military

training at a reasonable time after the law goes into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELSTON) there were—ayes 83, noes 132.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ELSTON and Mr. KILDAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, noes 186.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: Page 46, line 13, add the following: "Notwithstanding any provisions of this act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by any agency or department of the Federal Government."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is for the purpose of eliminating the issue which has arisen recently with reference to the deferment of college students on the basis of a national examination. That Executive order is based upon the recommendation and regulations of the Selective Service System and calls for an examination to be held not by the Selective Service System itself but by a contract which it has made with an examining service at Princeton, N. J.

My amendment, if adopted, will insure by law that students will be deferred no differently from anyone else entitled to deferment. The amendment takes quite a few words in order to repeat the language of the bill itself. It takes quite a few words to make sure they cannot contract with any other agency, but, boiled down, it simply says that no local board shall be required to defer any students on the basis of any national examination. Therefore the college student will report to his local board just as anyone else. He will apply for deferment just as anyone else, and the local board has the absolute right to grant or to refuse deferment as it would in the case of a farm laborer and industrial employee, a person who has dependents, or any other ground for deferment that is within the jurisdiction of the local board, subject to the same appeal as any other deferment. So that this brings it back entirely to the local board and to the appeal system of the Selective Service System. Students will be treated as

everyone else. There will be no danger of students being deferred by orders of the National Selective Service System based upon an examination.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that under the gentleman's amendment a local draft board, if it sees fit, can defer a man to go on to college under the same conditions as are contained in the Executive order of the President and the Director of Selective Service?

Mr. KILDAY. The existing law and the 1940 law have always been that the President has the power to create categories of persons to be deferred in the national health, safety, and interest. My amendment will preserve the law as it always has been.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I live in Rensselaer, Ind. We have a local draft board there composed of very high-grade men. Under the gentleman's amendment could they defer all of the boys who want to go on to college and who can meet certain qualifications, while the draft board in some other area, say New York City, says: "No; we are not going to defer any of these boys because we think they should all go into the service."

Mr. KILDAY. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that the result he states is correct, except that this is subject to appeal by the Selective Service System. The same situation exists as to every other person applying for deferment, and has always existed. My amendment will insure that the law remains as it is and always has been. It will insure that students applying for deferment will be on exactly the same basis as anyone else applying for deferment. The local board has jurisdiction in the first place, and they have the appeals as in all other cases.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman knows when you get to the matter of appeal there is not much that can be done about it. Personally, I recognize that great latitude must be left in the local draft boards. They have a terrific job to do, but at the same time, when it comes to this broad category of deferment, why should the boy in Indiana be denied deferment to go on to college and in some other places all of them be deferred, which, as I understand, is what could happen under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. That is what could happen in any instance. This puts these students on exactly the same basis as every other person registered under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not think it does that, if I may say so to the gentleman, with all respect, because I recognize his great capacity in these matters. But he just said to me, in response to a question, that his amendment would still leave in the local boards, if they saw fit, authority to defer any boy who wanted to go on to college under the regulations presently in effect.

Mr. KILDAY. The point is that everybody in the United States has been subject to the same law. Suppose one of the people in your town in Indiana goes in and applies for deferment because he is working in an airplane factory, and they deny it, but the man in New York goes in and they grant it. That has been the case and will always be the case unless you want to abolish the jurisdiction of the local board, and I do not believe anybody wants to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. The matter of coordinating that must be the same as it has always been and as it worked satisfactorily during the war and under the 1948 act, that the Selective Service System, through its agents, will appeal those cases in which they feel that deferment was not justified. I know of no other way to handle it. I do not want the Federal Government choosing who is to go to college, and the only thing I know of, is to put the thing right back in the local boards where it belongs, where the friends and neighbors are passing on it, in accordance with true democracy and the way we have always run selective service and the way it has operated successfully.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will the gentleman explain to the committee the difference between his amendment as first enunciated and printed in the RECORD last week and the amendment he proposes today, and will he inform the House why he has changed his amendment?

Mr. KILDAY. The result of the amendment that I proposed originally and the result of this amendment is identical. The other one was drawn rather hastily and after consideration I found that there might be a possible construction under the amendment I originally proposed, that if a man passed this examination and his local board had held he should be deferred, I would have deprived his local draft board of deferring him. I possibly covered too many agencies in the first amendment which I drew.

Mr. HOEVEN. But the gentleman's first amendment was stronger in that respect.

Mr. KILDAY. Not one particle stronger.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it will have the effect of doing away with Gen-

eral Hershey's order passed a few days ago; is that not right?

Mr. KILDAY. Well, he may hold the examinations, but they are not going to be binding on the boards down in Georgia, or in New York, or anywhere else. They are going to pass on it with all the evidence before them just as they would do if a farmhand went up for deferment or a worker in an airplane factory or anybody else.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. As I understand, under the gentleman's amendment the taking of the examination would merely be advisory to the board and not binding; is that right?

Mr. KILDAY. That is all. Not even necessarily that, just an item of evidence to be considered in the whole case in passing on the question of deferment.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman says it does not change the power of the draft board one bit from what the law has been heretofore?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. It will be just as it was during the war when we took in so many millions of boys, and we did it rather satisfactorily, and as it has been in the 1948 act. It insures that no agency of the Federal Government on the basis of an examination is going to require a local board or an appeal board to defer a man simply because he is a student and has enough money to go to college, when the other boy has to go in the service.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Will not the taking of this examination be rather an influence on the board that they should exempt these students and treat them differently than they treat the average American citizen?

Mr. KILDAY. It should not be.

Mr. KEAN. Why have the examination at all?

Mr. KILDAY. The Senate passed a bill that is pending in this House calling for the deferment of 75,000 people every year. We do not know which law is going to take effect. If the Senate provision should be adopted, then there is going to have to be some basis for the 75,000 selection. So the time is running out. This has to be ready by fall. Whether they will go on with the examination or not, I do not know, but if they do, this assures that the examination does not determine the deferment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The effect of this amendment is that there will be no discretion in the authority of the local draft board. The examination will simply give the board more evidence on which to base their position for possible deferment for a college student.

Mr. KILDAY. It preserves the integrity and the autonomy of the local board.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that if we do not pass the gentleman's amendment and the present Presidential order stands, the number deferred will presumably be greatly beyond 75,000?

Mr. KILDAY. Under the Presidential order?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, I am sure it will be.

Mr. KEATING. Does it not run into the many hundreds of thousands?

Mr. KILDAY. It is very difficult to get a figure as to how many there are, considering the IV-F's and the ROTC people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. If a very much larger number were deferred, would that not necessarily result in a larger number of the noncollege boys being called?

Mr. KILDAY. Certainly. Every time you defer one man somebody else has to go.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understood the gentleman to refer to some examining board. What was that board?

Mr. KILDAY. It is the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under what supervision is it?

Mr. KILDAY. It is a private institution that conducts examinations on a Nation-wide basis for a lot of different clients, including the Navy in connection with its ROTC-Holloway plan, and things of that kind.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman tell me what justification there is for General Hershey's having these so-called "smart boy" examinations in the light of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KILDAY. If I could be assured that my amendment was going to be enacted into law that would be one thing, but we have another body to deal with. All I am interested in is trying to see that he is not going to defer "smart boys" on the basis of a national examination, and I think I have accomplished that by the amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The amendment offered by the gentleman deals with one of



the most complex and difficult aspects of this whole program. I think it is as meritorious, fair, just, and equitable as human nature can make it. The only thing I think the gentleman should bring out, so that it will be clear in the minds of some of our colleagues, is that they are going to be selected on a percentage basis. Perhaps three-fourths of the seniors in college will be deferred, about two-thirds, as I recall, of the juniors, and about 50 percent of the freshmen. That will apply in all the schools and universities all over the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. Without regard to any mental test and without any Government agency's going out and getting them. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. KILDAY. It is not to exceed those percentages in those cases.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I ask the gentleman from Missouri how you are going to bring about that result if the gentleman from Texas is correct in saying this leaves the matter completely and wholly in the hands of the local boards? What do they know about what percentage they are entitled to?

Mr. SHORT. Where else can you place it?

Mr. KILDAY. It is still in the local board. It is permissive and not mandatory.

Mr. SHORT. It is an advisory capacity.

Mr. KILDAY. It is advisory, not mandatory in any sense of the word.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think most of us have been somewhat disturbed about the prospects for deferment and possible eventual escape from military service of the so-called bright boys or the wealthy boys. I should like to know just what the gentleman's amendment does other than actually nullify the directive from the Selective Service?

Mr. KILDAY. That is all it does. It simply provides that the board is not bound by any examination, no matter how many they give. It is still up to the people in Texas, Florida, Missouri, Indiana, or wherever they may be.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite possible and probable that the position I shall take on this amendment may not meet with the agreement of a majority of the House, but I would hope that they might take the same position.

I appeared before the Committee on Armed Services on this subject. I here call your attention to the fact that we are setting up, even including the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], a system of priorities of persons entitled to college educations that his amendment does not

touch at all. The first priority goes to those whom we, the Members of the House and Senate, and the President, appoint to West Point and Annapolis. They become entitled to a college education and they get it. They also get graduate courses if they are sufficiently high in the ranks of graduates at West Point and Annapolis. That is the first priority which is being established regardless of the Kilday amendment. The second priority goes to those who may achieve an ROTC appointment, whether it be the regular ROTC or by contract. They likewise will be entitled to complete their college education. Let us not forget that—there are quite a number of them, too. Their only qualification aside from their being able to pass this same test which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is referring to, is that they are practically physically perfect specimens, because their physical examination is identical to the examination given to candidates for West Point and Annapolis.

The third category of deferments of course goes to those who cannot pass the 1945 January 1 test, the physical test, for induction into the armed services. Obviously they will be entitled to go on to college if they can gain entrance. Therefore, you are creating a group who may be physically qualified for induction into the armed services, but not physically qualified for admission into West Point or Annapolis, or for acceptance into the ROTC, but who likewise may be just as intelligent as any of those persons accepted for ROTC. I want you to get that and get it carefully because you are setting up a system and a scale of priorities here for education which is a vitally important thing.

If we are looking forward only to 2 or 3 years, or perhaps 4 years, of emergency conditions throughout the world where we need to exercise the Draft Act, then that may not be so bad, but if we are looking forward to a period of 10 years, as many people in high places say, or perhaps 20 years, then this is social legislation of the first order because now even with or without Mr. KILDAY's amendment you are setting up priorities for those who may achieve a college education.

In that circumstance you are making an exception of a group which is good enough to be inducted under the January 1, 1945, schedule of physical ratings but who are not physically qualified for admission to West Point or Annapolis or the ROTC on the other hand and you say to that group, "You get no deferment because you are good enough to be enlisted in the armed services, but you are not good enough to go to West Point or be in the ROTC—not good enough physically—not mentally."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Referring to the Kilday amendment, the question is this: Suppose you have a son, or twin sons, let us say, both going to medical school; one in the University of Southern California, and one at the Univer-

sity of California. Could one local board say to one of your sons that he must go into the service, while the other local board in the other city says that he does not have to go?

Mr. HINSHAW. Exactly so. That is why I am opposed to the Kilday amendment. As long as we are going to set up physical standards that are constant over the entire country regardless of brains and ability, then if you are going to make that kind of a selection, let us also set up a national standard for mental ability, so that we may have the best-trained people in the country. What we need in this country is brains and ability. We need to develop brains. I am going to quote to you from the RECORD part of a statement of General Byers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, General Byers said this before the committee, while I was present, and I heard him:

We feel we are responsible to furnish to the youth of the Nation the best possible trained officers that we may get them, and we feel we should be very derelict in our duty if we did not plan to take 4-year college men to lead these boys, rather than use the emergency of taking those that happen to come into officer-candidate school. I am not criticizing the product of the officer-candidate school, but they are not required to be college graduates.

Then later he says:

The officer-candidate-school graduate was a very, very sound small-unit leader. He had been thoroughly trained in all elements of detail and performed small-unit leadership in an outstanding degree but his utility beyond that was in direct proportion to the education which he had had before he started the OCS.

What you are doing here, if you do not have some such examination as General Hershey has proposed, is that you are going to definitely limit the number of men who can get, let us say, 2 years of college education. Therefore, you are going to limit the quality of the officers in the service. That is a very vitally important matter.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman has failed to point out this fact, that a man has 4 years of service once he graduates from Annapolis or West Point; also, under this measure and the amendment we adopted yesterday offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], if a man is deferred for physics, chemistry, or some other subject, and he continues his college education for 4 years, he is still subject to service under this measure of 26 months or whatever number of months we adopt in its final form up to the age of 35 years.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; I agree with the gentleman entirely. The fact of deferment to obtain this education, the benefits of which the country needs so badly in large quantity, does not mean that he escapes service. It is quite possible that the service he may have to perform after he graduates will be a good deal worse than the service that is being performed now in Korea by so many of our boys. No one can foretell the future, and anyone deferred under this provision is liable for service until he is 35, not until he is 26, as is the case of the enlisted draftee under this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is not the gentleman giving this amendment too wide an interpretation? And is not that perhaps the reason for the gentleman's disquiet? Is it not a fact that even if this amendment is passed General Hershey by a general order or a particular draft board by individual order can take certain classes?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct. But the thing that disturbs the young manhood of America more than anything else today is uncertainty as to the future—I think I know, because I have boys of my own—uncertainty as to the future, what he may do and what he may not do, and when. That is the thing that upsets him; it is the thing that makes some boys go out and commit misdemeanors in order to be jailed to avoid service, and a lot of other things like that. It is the uncertainty as to what they are going to be able to do.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I thoroughly agree with the statement that these boys have been off-balance for the last 6 years and are going to be.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. Certainty is the only thing I see that will bring them back onto balance. Among other things they should be in a position to know that if they are qualified to obtain an education within the operation of this law they will be able to proceed with it, even though if they do proceed with it they may have to serve 10 years longer in the Reserves.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman speaks of certainty; how will the certainty come about?

Mr. HINSHAW. By testing; it will take the same identical procedure as testing for acceptance into the ROTC.

Mr. JAVITS. Therefore the gentleman feels that to get certainty you need this testing procedure.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think you have to have some uniformity in the administration of the Draft Act in this country so the boys may know that if they can pass a certain examination, meaning that they have brains and ability, that they can proceed and the next year if they can pass another examination they can go on and so on to graduation

before they are called into military service.

I am opposed to the Kilday amendment because it will eliminate the only assurance the young man can have of uniform treatment across the country; and because it will, in my opinion, result in a lower educational level for our country in years to come. We need to increase the general level of education—not decrease it—if for no other reason than the very obvious fact that we live in a highly technical and scientific age. Who will deny that warfare itself is most highly technical and requires all the scientific brain power we can muster for the invention, the design and manufacture—yes, and the use and maintenance of the equipment of armies, navies and air forces.

One good brain employed in science can save thousands of bodies and the lives those bodies were born with. The British recognized that fact long ago and I have no doubt that the Russians did likewise. Are we too dumb to see it?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Kilday amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: On page 29, line 4, following the words "(including the Canal Zone)", strike out the period, substitute a colon and the following: "Provided, That no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the purpose of transporting or maintaining any person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title in violation of the provisions of this paragraph."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the point at which this amendment is offered is at the end of the paragraph requiring 4 months of basic training and prohibiting the sending of any of these inductees into a combat area less than 6 months after entering the service.

The bill as drafted provides that they shall not be sent into a combat area within a period less than 6 months after entering the service. This amendment is designed to strengthen and make doubly sure that they are not sent under any contention whether it be right or wrong that the President has the power to send them where he pleases. We prohibit his using any funds appropriated by Congress to transport or maintain any of these inductees in violation of the prohibition that they shall not be sent into a combat area or outside the United States for training except into the Territories. It is doubly safe; he cannot use the money in addition to being prohibited by law.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman advise the House what remedy an individual might have who finds himself on a transport destined to some foreign area in violation not only of the committee provision but of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KILDAY. I think he would probably find himself in a pretty unfortunate situation. But it certainly is not weakening the prohibition when we give the Comptroller General the power to charge back any money that may be expended in violation of law.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman consider this amendment will take care of the powers of Congress to restrict the President so far as an appropriation bill is concerned?

Mr. KILDAY. I believe it would constitute a valid restriction on funds appropriated for any purpose. You might restrict the military in an appropriation bill and you might restrict funds which may be appropriated to the Maritime Commission, or something of that kind, in the operation of ships. This would catch all of them.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman feel the same type of amendment should be offered to the appropriation bill for the armed services?

Mr. KILDAY. It would not weaken it any.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As members of the Military Appropriations Committee we have seen some instances, not exactly like this, but they could be similar. You can find occasions where some of these men, contrary to an act of Congress and its expressed will, were being placed on ships bound for Europe. Under the gentleman's provision for 2 months they could not get any pay, they could not get any food, they could not get any lodgings, they could not have any rations of any kind. I know what the gentleman means and it should not be necessary to put in an amendment like this. The military should heed the directives of Congress. But if you find one or two or a hundred or a thousand of these men who are shipped over contrary to the will of Congress, where will they get their relief or pay for this period of time?

Mr. KILDAY. My experience has been that if you vote an amendment of this kind, if you have this provision in the bill, it will be followed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We have had similar instances, for instance presently where you have a large group of disabled marines who have been serving without pay for a period of 3 months because of a violation of the use of funds. They cannot be paid.

Mr. KILDAY. I am not familiar with that case.

Mr. SCRIVNER. So the situation could arise.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago I stood with the Members of this House on the left and applauded the name of the great General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur. I did that out of esteem for this great American, this great military commander, whose picture, I might say, is on the wall of my office, because when the Philippine Islands were liberated I stood as close to him as I am to this rostrum on the day the official ceremony took place turning Leyte Island, the first one liberated, back to President Osmeña of the Government-in-exile of the Philippine Islands. But when the gentlemen on the left allude to impeachment and say nothing more, I think it behooves some of us to speak out on the question that has arisen.

Mr. Chairman, it seems obvious that General MacArthur desired to be relieved of his command. As a great military leader, he most certainly knew that his continued open defiance of civilian authority could end in no other way, unless, of course, our civilian authorities and our entire Military Establishment were willing to surrender to General MacArthur their right to decide upon and direct the foreign and military policies of this Nation. It seems evident that the general preferred dismissal to the execution of policies in which he lacks faith. He could, of course, have resigned, but such a course would be less consistent with his singular personality than the more dramatic course which he has forced upon the President.

As one who served for 2 years under the general, part of the time at his headquarters, and as one who has the highest regard and admiration for him, I deeply regret that he has made his dismissal necessary by his refusal to work as one of the team, even though he could not direct the entire team. Teamwork is essential to military operations, and to the execution of foreign policies. This Nation cannot afford to permit military commanders in the field to have complete freedom to do as they please in the matter of over-all world-wide strategy.

The dismissal of the general does not end the differences of opinion over our policies, and I hope that his freedom from command duties will make it possible for him to vigorously espouse his views in the political arena, which is the proper forum for the foreign policy debate, which he could not and should not carry on as a military commander in the field.

It is no secret to those who have served close to the general that he has little regard for the ability of his contemporaries in our Military Establishment. He probably has even less regard for our contemporary political leaders who must, at all times, give consideration to public opinion. I venture to guess that

the general will be disappointed with the reaction of the public when he is compelled to present his views outside of the privileged sanctuary which he has occupied for so many years. Much water has flowed under the bridge since the general visited his native land.

One cannot help note that some of the Republicans, who now stress their admiration for the general, gave him almost no consideration when his name was presented to the Republican National Convention as a candidate for President of the United States.

General MacArthur and many others apparently feel we should take the risk of seeing the controlled fire in Korea expanded into a world-wide conflagration by launching direct attacks against China, thereby bringing into operation the Chinese-Soviet agreement for mutual assistance which we believe to exist. This is a crux of the issue.

Most of the leaders of the free world feel that we should try to keep the Korean conflagration localized, at least until we are better prepared to deal with world-wide hostilities. They feel that time is now on our side. General MacArthur, and those who support his views, evidently feel that time is against us, and that we should not hesitate to throw down the gauntlet to Russia immediately. Many of those who are recommending more war in Asia are decrying even our augmentation of the growing strength of Western Europe. This is a strange paradox, because even General MacArthur has indicated that he views the war in Asia as a means of conquering the west, which would seem to indicate that the west is the final important objective. It seems to me that it may be possible, although exceedingly difficult, to defend the Western World if all Asia falls to the Communists, but certainly no defense of Asia would be possible if Western Europe were allowed to come under Soviet domination.

The fortunes of any one man during his short stay on this whirling sphere are unimportant compared with the great policies and decisions which shape the course of history for millions yet unborn. The expansion of hostilities which the general favors involves the lives of millions of people, and these policies and decisions should be and must be decided upon deliberately and in accord with our regular constitutional processes. History may show General MacArthur's views to have been correct, but the people of the United States retain the right to direct their ship of state, even though future generations may decide that the contemporary one erred in choosing its course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from California that earlier in the current week, the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives told our country we were never in greater danger, and that the Russians were concentrating here, there, and everywhere. At about the same time General Ridgway, who now succeeds General MacArthur in the field, made it plain in a statement that we just could not possibly win under present conditions and policies.

Now, what does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. YORTY. I think exactly as I said. Most of the world leaders, with few exceptions in the free world, believe that we are better off at this time to keep the fire that is burning in Korea localized until we are ready to deal with a world-wide war. Most of them also feel that if we launch a direct attack against the Chinese mainland now we may set off a world-wide war; that we may lose Japan and the Philippines immediately, and I think we all know that the consequences are so great that the point I want to make is this: You cannot decide those policies in Japan through a supreme military commander in a particular area. They have got to be decided here, and I am glad the General is coming here to give us his views.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, but I would like to ask him this question, because it has been running through my mind for a long time. If we are not going to fight to win in Korea, then why fight there at all?

Mr. YORTY. I agree with the gentleman to this extent, that we have got to try and find a solution to get out of the Korean situation. But we cannot, in my humble judgment, get out of it by setting off a world-wide war right now—a war for which we are not ready. We are perhaps better prepared to establish a stalemate and, if possible, negotiate a means to get out. I do not know whether or not that can be done, but I do know that General MacArthur cannot decide the matter in Japan in defiance of the civilian authority in this country.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Kilday amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Kilday amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HALLECK, Mr. GROSS, and Mr. O'HARA asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. JUDD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels it would only be fair to point out the fact that the gentleman from California secured unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate may proceed out of order for these 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the arguments of the gentleman from California are very appealing. They are the arguments that have been used by the administration constantly during this whole far eastern struggle, the naive belief that somehow we can prevent the spread of the Korean war by yielding to or being soft toward the aggressors outside of Korea.

In my judgment, the number one fallacy that is responsible for our difficulties today as it was after World War I and World War II is the notion that we can get peace by weakening our side and building up the other side. The real tragedy of the President's dismissal of General MacArthur today is that it will weaken us in Asia and allow the Communists there further to build up for the expansion of the war which they have long proclaimed as their firm objective.

The removal of General MacArthur represents the Kremlin's greatest victory since Yalta. That deal, too, looked as if it brought peace with the Kremlin; but it brought war instead. It weakened the free world and built up the Soviet world, and led right straight to the invasion of Korea. Because it was at Yalta that the Russians were brought into Manchuria. If there had not been Russians in Manchuria there never could have been a Korea, some 8,000 American boys who are now dead would be still living and we would not be at war.

The President's unwise action greatly strengthens the Soviet position in Asia, greatly weakens the position of the United States, and thereby makes far more likely the world war that you and I so genuinely and sincerely desire to prevent.

I do not hesitate to predict that the danger of all-out war in Asia, and in Europe and the Middle East, too, is much greater today than it has been before. No one should be surprised if Korea,

Japan, the Philippines, and much of the rest of east Asia now come quickly under Soviet control—unless even more of America's limited military strength is thrown into action against it. It was not MacArthur, but the very people who say they want most of all to save Europe who followed policies which got most of our military strength bogged down in Korea and Japan so that it cannot be used to help save Europe. And today's action will make it harder to get our forces extricated unless we let all Asia go to Red control. The security of Japan is particularly endangered. Here is fist-shaped Hokkaido, the northern island of Japan. Coming down to the northwestern corner of that island is Sakhalin, the southern half of which was given by us to the Russians at Yalta. It was not ours, but we gave it to them anyway. Coming down to the northeast corner are the Kurile Islands, also given to the Russians at Yalta. It has been known since January that the Russians are building up their strength in those two positions where they can almost see across to Japan. I am not telling them anything they do not know when I say that if the confidence of the Japanese in us should falter, the Russians could take Japan within 2 weeks, and with bombing of Pusan and submarines in the straits, could cut off practically all of America's trained land forces in Korea. They could eliminate us as a first-rate land power for a year or more while they did whatever they wished in Europe or the rest of Asia. That is why, at this time, it could be fatal to crumble our position in Japan, a position that belongs uniquely to General MacArthur. It is not because he is an American; it is not because he represents the allies that he maintains stability in Japan; it is because he is Gen. Douglas MacArthur. In a sense, he moved into the position in Japanese minds that the Japanese Emperor formerly occupied. To destroy his position in Japan, which is bound before long to be the focus of the far eastern situation, is flirting with disaster.

It is argued by the wishful thinkers, "Well, let us make peace with the Chinese Reds. Let us negotiate some kind of a deal and end the war in Korea." General MacArthur, from what he is reported to have said, obviously and rightly believes that you cannot end a war with people bent on world conquest until you win the war. Some other countries tried at Munich to get peace with aggressors. Our Government tried at Tehran and at Yalta and Potsdam to get good relations with Communists by giving them what they said they wanted. But always what they say they want is not what they want. What they want is conquest—most of all conquest of the United States of America because we are all that stands between them and world domination. There is nothing that we can give them in a political deal or compromise which will end the war; it would only move the conflict to another country and make it more difficult. This act of the President's will so weaken our position in Asia and the strength there built up at such terrible cost that it will be a miracle if war does not soon spread all over the area. In

short, I fear the action will do just the opposite of what the administration has claimed it is trying to do. That is, it will expand the war in Asia, rather than contain it in Korea.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from California spoke about peace. Of course we all desire peace. Some of us have regretted the fact that the course of conduct of our Government in recent years has not been such as to achieve peace. No man has spoken out more vigorously in respect to this matter as it has gone along than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], who is now addressing the committee. He also spoke of political decisions and of civilian control. Certainly everyone in this country would want civilian control maintained in those spheres that are properly the subject of civilian control. Of course I want the political leaders to have the power to make the political decision but by the same token I want military decisions in this country to be made by military leaders. Nothing, in my opinion, could be more frightening to the American people and more terrifying than to know that the judgment of our military leaders in respect to military matters bearing on our national defense is to be superseded and overruled by the political leaders, Truman and Acheson.

In my opinion the basic difference between General MacArthur and the President and those others with the President in the political department of the Government who sought and have brought about his firing has been basically the difference as to military decisions which have been differences of opinion on how to fight and win a war. When American boys are dying in Asia and in Korea, then certainly the opinion of the military leaders is of extreme importance to the Congress and to the country. I would regret to see the day when the Congress of the United States, with our great responsibility, should be deprived of the advice and judgment and convictions of the military leaders in whom we have faith and upon whom we must depend.

Mr. JUDD. That is correct. No one questions the President's right or power to do what he has done. What we question is the wisdom of his action.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Union and its satellites are at war with the United States and with the whole free world. Some people say we must not start a war or strike first. No one need worry longer about that one. It is too late for us to strike first. The other side has already struck. The only question we face, and have faced for years, is how and where and when we shall strike back in order to be most effective. That is the only decision we have—unless we are to surrender piecemeal.

They are at war with us. They are committed to our destruction. Where are we going to fight them? How are we going to fight them? With what and with whom are we going to fight them? Do we want to do it all alone in Asia, which is where they are already fighting openly? The urgent question is not



whether there is to be a bigger war after awhile, but how we can win the war in which we already are. That is the best way to prevent the bigger war after awhile.

If you were a citizen of a country under Communist threat in Asia today and saw the No. 1 bulwark against Communist expansion in Asia abruptly withdrawn, what would you conclude? Surely, that Communist victory in Asia is practically certain; and that there is nothing to do but to give up and get on the Red bandwagon. And this fateful turn in our fortunes comes at the moment when Communist China is much weaker than it has been, with terrible losses in Korea and powerful uprisings at home. We are presenting it with an unbelievable reprieve. It will be a miracle, I repeat, if today's action and those that will follow do not lead to a deterioration of the whole far-eastern situation, with country after country going down like nine pins. Then, indeed, we will have world war III—and worse, very possibly defeat in it.

In my humble judgment that is the disaster which General MacArthur saw ahead for his country; and that is what has driven him to do and say some things which go against all of his strict military traditions and training and which must have wrenched his soul. He saw the danger both to the lives of men under his command and to the security of his country, and he was trying to get out into the open before the public a realization of the peril to the United States of America of a policy of drift; or a policy of doing just enough to get men killed, but not enough to win; or a policy of trying to end the fighting by making another deal which would look like peace, but which would strengthen the enemy and weaken ourselves and lead to more costly fighting.

My concern is not for General MacArthur. He is a giant whom the pygmies cannot tolerate because he has been so consistently right about Asia and they so consistently wrong. His place in history is secure. It will vindicate him and condemn his opponents who threw away in five short years the magnificent victory in the Pacific which he and 4,000,000 Americans won at such great cost—108,000 of them with their lives.

My concern is for the peace and security of the United States.

Few people seem to realize the completely unique position of prestige and confidence which General MacArthur commanded in Asia, and especially in Japan. His removal is likely to open the way for the Communists to chip away and destroy the faith of the Japanese people in us and in the United Nations. If that happens, then a "settlement" in Korea will not end the war; it will just move it from Korea to Japan. If we abandon Formosa in a futile effort to buy the Reds off, we do not end the struggle; we simply shift it from Formosa to the Philippines. And if we let the Philippines and Japan go, "in order to avoid war with Communist China or Russia," do we solve the problem? No. We just move the conflict to Alaska and Hawaii. And if we sell them out "in order to get peace," we do not avoid

world war III; we just make certain that more of it will be fought in the northwestern States of our own country.

We have to stop this glacier somewhere. We did not stop it at the 50-yard line at the end of the last war. Instead we moved back to our 40-yard line and invited the Russians to take Eastern Europe, Manchuria, North Korea, and the strategically placed islands north of Japan. Now we are down to about our 30-yard line due to the idiotic attempt to make the Chinese Communists our friends by walking out on our Chinese allies. Now it is proposed, in line with British ideas, to move back to the 20-yard line—the move MacArthur opposed so strenuously. Just where are we to stop retreating? At our 10-yard line when only Europe remains? Or the 5-yard line when only the Western Hemisphere remains? Or the 1-yard line when only the interior of the United States remains?

I do not want to have to fight at the last ditch for the sheer survival of the United States. That is the real issue: not the fate of MacArthur, but of ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is recognized.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from California, I, too, stood in the presence of General MacArthur on the steps of the capitol on the island of Leyte in the Philippines. I have known MacArthur for many years. In all my 34 years' military experience I have yet to meet a grander military man than the general.

Yesterday I introduced a resolution to the effect that the President of the United States should direct General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur to return to the United States and report to a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the problems and probabilities of the Korean situation.

In view of the action taken by President Truman in relieving General MacArthur of his command I have introduced another House resolution which states as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur return to the United States immediately and report on the progress, problems, and probabilities of the Korean situation at a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, President Truman's action in relieving General MacArthur of his far-eastern command has shocked the American people and reveals that the administration is more interested in the socialistic government of Great Britain and her trade with Communist China than supporting the MacArthur program for a speedy and complete victory in Korea.

The action of President Truman will have a stimulating effect on the forces of Communist Russia who now can expect Red China to be admitted to the United Nations—a move that has been encouraged by Great Britain.

General MacArthur's position took into consideration the best interests of the American people and especially the

mothers, fathers, wives, and sweethearts of the boys serving under him in Korea where already 9,000 of them made the supreme sacrifice and nearly 60,000 more are on the casualty list.

It is a downright shame that the American people must wait until 1952 to express their indignation at the polls over the shabby treatment accorded General MacArthur and the Americans serving under him. Make no mistake about it there will be a wholesale housecleaning in the White House and the State Department in 1952 because the American people have never been sold on the Truman-Acheson-Hiss brand of international diplomacy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] is recognized.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, the tragic news that President Truman has removed General MacArthur as the United Nations commander in the Far East has shocked and stunned many of us here in Washington just as it has the American people throughout the Nation. The President announced his dismissal of MacArthur at 1 a. m., Washington time, on Wednesday morning when most of the people in the Capital City were asleep. The announcement apparently came at this time in order that administration forces in the Congress could have time to prepare to meet the storm of protest from other Congressmen who are now speaking out against this tragic action.

The President has declared that MacArthur was relieved of his far-eastern commands because he was unable to give his full support to the policies of the United Nations. But the real reason MacArthur has been fired, has been because of the conflict between MacArthur on the one hand, and Mr. Truman and Dean Acheson on the other, in regard to United States policy toward Communist China and the war in Korea. America's great fighting general, under whom I served as an enlisted man in the South Pacific during World War II, has demanded the right to bomb concentrations of Chinese troops and supplies in Manchuria to slow down and cut off Chinese Communist forces now killing our boys in Korea. Truman and Acheson refused this request. MacArthur has asked for the authority to use in Korea some of the more than 600,000 Nationalist troops now on Formosa and has even suggested a Nationalist attack against the Chinese mainland to ease the pressure on the American forces now fighting against a numerically superior enemy in Korea. Truman and Acheson have refused. MacArthur has called the Korean conflict a full-scale war where we have suffered nearly 60,000 casualties. Truman and Acheson have called it a police action. MacArthur has demanded that the British and other United Nations countries stop sending supplies to Communist China through Hong Kong and other ports and has called for a full blockade of the China coast. Truman and Acheson have sided with the British who continue to send war supplies to the Communists to be used in the killing of Americans in Korea. In the years before the Korean

war began, MacArthur constantly spoke out, warning this Nation against appeasement of communism and urged that a positive foreign policy be carried out to check aggression in the Pacific and other parts of the world. Truman and Acheson abandoned China to the Communists and said the Reds were our friends and just agrarian reformers. They appeased and appeased and appeased. They were helped in this task by Alger Hiss and other pro-Communists they had appointed to serve in the State Department.

Thus the controversy between the Truman administration and MacArthur raged. Mr. Truman charged that MacArthur has refused to take orders from the President as Commander in Chief, but many others charged that it was Mr. Truman who was refusing to take orders from the American people, who demanded that our Government cease its policy of appeasement in the Far East. This week the President made a decision. The issue was clear. Should he accept MacArthur's suggestions and recognize the realities of the war in Korea, or should he dismiss MacArthur and once again bow to the demands of Dean Acheson, who has made so many mistakes in the past? Mr. Truman took the second course. He fired MacArthur, the hero of Bataan, and bowed to Acheson, the man who said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss and who called the Chinese Communists mere agrarian reformers.

This was a tragic decision. The majority of the American people would be far happier and would have far more confidence in our leadership if Acheson had been fired, not MacArthur. For many months now the people have demanded the removal of Dean Acheson, but when the show-down finally came, Acheson emerged triumphant, and America's valiant soldier, General MacArthur, became the martyr of the Kansas City political machine which has seized control of the executive branch of our Government. There was another great American general who was a martyr, and he, like MacArthur, tried to speak out in an effort to strengthen the military forces of this Nation. You will remember him, General "Billy" Mitchell, who dared to urge the brass hats and the Nation's leaders to develop a powerful Air Force. MacArthur now joins Gen. "Billy" Mitchell as a martyr and as a hero.

Since the announcement of General MacArthur's removal public opinion has begun to mount in opposition. My office has already been flooded with telegrams protesting this arbitrary action. By repudiating the wise and inspirational leadership of General MacArthur, Mr. Truman has done more than any Communist bomb could do to disunite and weaken our American people at this hour of national emergency.

As this confusion sweeps across the Nation, I should like to suggest the following affirmative steps to be taken by our Government:

First, the Congress should bring General MacArthur back to this country and to Washington so that he might speak out without fear of further reprisals by

the White House and advise the American people of the true facts of the war in Korea and make recommendations for the development of a positive and affirmative policy for the Far East. And when MacArthur returns to this country, he should be given a hero's welcome, unparalleled in our history.

Second, after General MacArthur has given us the benefit of his wise counsel, and if he so recommends, we should authorize our new commander in the Far East General Ridgway to bomb the concentrations of Communist troops and supplies in Manchuria. If General MacArthur so recommends, we should authorize General Ridgway to send to Korea some of the hundreds of thousands of Chinese Nationalist soldiers now on Formosa. As part of our new policy, we should demand that the British and other United Nations members stop sending vital supplies and materials to the Chinese Communists. We should demand that the United Nations impose enforceable sanctions against any shipment of supplies to Soviet Russia and her satellite countries. As part of this new policy, we should begin at once a blockade of the China coast.

Third, we must proceed with full vigor and speed to develop our national defense program. We must demand that the President take immediate action to rid our Government of the corruption and political favoritism which has hampered our defense effort and seriously jeopardized the lives of our fighting men in Korea. We must demand that the President select able statesmen and not mere politicians to guide the destinies of our Nation at this hour of national emergency.

Finally, in order to restore some of the confidence in the administration which is so lacking at this hour, the Congress and the American people should demand that Dean Acheson be replaced as our Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the things that I have to say on the merits of this controversy will be said presently in the Republican conference this afternoon. Removal of General MacArthur from his command will have unpredictable and most serious consequences, that much is clear.

The two things that I feel called upon to say now are these: First, on the question of responsibility, that we are dealing here with foreign affairs questions—and that the man who is charged by the Constitution with the conduct of our foreign affairs is the President of the United States. He is the one—and his administration—whom the people of America can and must hold accountable. Let us keep our eyes clear as to where fault is to be found and how correction is to be made.

Since I have been in the Congress, I have been fighting for a decisive Far East foreign policy based upon a Pacific Pact for self-help and mutual cooperation in the defense against communism by all the non-Communist Asiatic peoples, and a Far East recovery program

for improving conditions of health, education, and food production, and so forth. If we had taken this course looking to the military defense of China and to the improvement of the economic conditions of the Chinese people, we would not have been left in the lurch with a discredited Chinese Nationalist Government as far as the people of mainland China were concerned or faced the catastrophic defeat of the Chinese Nationalist forces at the hands of the Communists. Since that time I have opposed appeasement of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations, or elsewhere, or permitting them to get Formosa. I have also urged that we should have government in Formosa based upon free institutions and economic development. The administration's handling of the Far East foreign policy has been bankrupt and is largely responsible for our present troubles. It is this administration which must bear the full responsibility for that bankruptcy of policy and from which our people must demand their accounting.

Second, on the question of power, let us remember that we are dealing with military discipline, that there are tens of thousands of troops throughout the world under the command of our generals, and that to these troops the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and that he has the power to remove any officer from his command. That is the essence of civilian control of the military. If the President is wrong in exercising his power as Commander in Chief, he must answer to the people and Congress. I am for putting the responsibility to account squarely where it belongs—on the President—and not getting off on any tangent of the power of the President to act as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

In the interest of the future of our Nation let us not go overboard on these two points.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a cardinal principle of American democracy is the supremacy of civilian control over the military. General MacArthur has defied that cardinal principle when he refused to conform his actions as a military man in the field to the policy set forth by the United Nations and his Commander in Chief.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have only 2 minutes; I cannot.

In American democracy we do not adhere to the principle of a monarch, a man of destiny, or a man on a white horse; we still reach our conclusions through democratic processes, and we do not have to have any god on horseback to mold the foreign policy of the United States and the United Nations. In my opinion the President is infinitely stronger with the American people, and I for one am perfectly willing to uphold his right as Commander in Chief to remove any general from any spot when that general refuses to conform to the



policy set forth by the Commander in Chief and the General Staff, not only the General Staff of the United States but the General Staffs of the United Nations members now waging the war in Korea.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. In speaking of keeping military policy under the control of military commanders, did not the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], overlook the fact that the leadership of the military in this country is the Secretary of Defense and the General Staff, and not some subordinate commander overseas?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, the gentleman overlooked that. As far as the political decisions of the American people are concerned in 1952, I am willing to stand up behind Mr. Truman and uphold his policy of removing General MacArthur and take my chances in the political arena.

On Wednesday of this week President Truman took forthright and courageous action to remove General MacArthur from his various military positions in the Far East.

The President was compelled to take this action when it became clear that General MacArthur was getting too big for his military breeches.

General MacArthur was not content to carry out his duties as a soldier. He aspired to be a statesman and a politician. He set himself up above the policy of his Government. He set himself up above the United Nations, even though he was designated by the United Nations to command the armed forces in Korea.

General MacArthur should have been removed several months ago when it became evident that serious military blunders had been committed in Korea.

As the President pointed out in his statement about MacArthur's removal, the general's place in history is well-established. It is not wise on General MacArthur's part to jeopardize his place in history by immersing himself in partisan politics and by attempting to formulate policy in the Far East.

The general acted in a unique capacity. He was the commander of the United States Armed Forces and civil servants in Japan. He was the supreme commander of the allied occupation powers in Japan, and commander in chief of the Far East Command, and commanding general of the United Nations armed forces in Korea.

In none of his various military or civilian roles did General MacArthur have the authority or responsibility to formulate or carry out independent or contradictory policy. In all of these capacities he should have executed his duties in harmony with the policies outlined by his superiors. He was charged only with the execution of military or administrative duties under the policies formulated by the President of the United States, the Far Eastern Commission, or the United Nations. General MacArthur had a perfect right, yes, a duty, to convey information, suggestions,

and advice to his superiors, but these communications should have been confidential, and not public utterances. Once his superiors had evaluated his advice in relation to the world problem, it was up to General MacArthur to execute their directives or resign his post. The President was very patient with General MacArthur, but patience has its limits.

General MacArthur stepped out of his jurisdiction as an executor of policy and arrogated to himself the role of policy maker once too often. The general is a man of great egotism. He considers himself a man of destiny, and is loath to take orders or suggestions from others. He expects implicit loyalty and obedience from his own subordinates, but apparently dislikes taking orders from his own superiors.

Twice in recent months he has overstepped his authority by making public pronouncements on matters of policy. The letter to Congressman MARTIN was a third offense. The Cease Fire Commission of the United Nations had been working for months toward peace in Korea. The representatives of 14 United Nations members were working on a draft of a new peace offer, when, suddenly, and prematurely, MacArthur went over their heads and offered to meet the Chinese Reds on the battlefield to arrange a truce, without consultation with his superiors. To make it worse, he coupled the offer of a truce with a veiled threat to extend the war to the coastal areas and interior bases of China, if the truce offer was rejected. In this instance, his superiors, the members of the United Nations were outraged. Not only did they resent his uncalled for interference in the delicate process of negotiation, but they feared his threat against the Chinese mainland might commit them in an unauthorized military action. When MacArthur jumped the gun this time—with a preliminary draft of his superiors on his desk—he committed the final and unforgivable sin of insubordination.

The mistrust which our friends in the United Nations now have of General MacArthur has caused mistrust of the good faith of United States foreign policy.

The President was justified in removing MacArthur. A new commander has been appointed who is willing to execute the policy of the United Nations. No man is greater than the team, and the team in this instance is the United Nations. General MacArthur could have been part of the team, but he could not be allowed to continue to create confusion and resentment among the nations which are actively participating in the Korean War.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the provisions in this bill for universal and compulsory military training in peacetime. It has no relation to the urgent dangers confronting us. The draft is the most fair and efficient and flexible method of providing men for our armed services. Compulsory universal military training

would establish a system of military control and indoctrination of the youth of the country as a permanent institution. It is no guaranty of military victory because every nation that has resorted to it has met defeat. In a century and a half this Nation has made better progress than any nation in the history of man and I think the main cause is that we have here preserved the utmost freedom for the greatest number of people over the largest area that has been known in all history. Thus the initiative and enterprise of the people were brought into play and we grew into the successful and prosperous Republic that men all over the earth now look to with hope. Let us use all the strength of the Nation to resist and overthrow any enemy, but let us not impair or destroy the chief source of our strength which is our freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment to S. 1: Strike out all of the language of the committee substitute and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

"(a) Subsection (a) of section 1 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This act may be cited as the 'Selective Service Act of 1951.'"

"(b) The first two sentences of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 19 and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 19 after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States: *Provided*, That any such person who has not attained the age of 19 shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be classified and examined physically and mentally in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces upon his attaining the age of 19. Any citizen of a foreign country, who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States."

"(c) The third sentence of the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is hereby amended to read: 'The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in

the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selection and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces and to further the purposes of this act."

"(d) The second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows: 'No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title until his acceptability in all respects including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, That the minimum standards for physical and mental acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945.'

"(e) Paragraph 4 of subsection (a) of section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Every person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall following his induction be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than 4 months, and no person inducted into the Armed Forces shall, during this 4 months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall, during the 6-month period immediately following his induction, be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions (including the Canal Zone).'

"(f) Subsection (b) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of 24 consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."

"(g) Subsection (c) of section 4 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any enlisted member of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during the effective period of this act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such Reserve component: *And provided further*, That any person who was a member of a Reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such Reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such Reserve component."

"(2) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of 18 and 26, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training

and service so long as he is deferred after classification."

"(3) Any person after attaining the age of 17 shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b)."

"(h) Subsection (d) of section 4 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to June 25, 1950, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth, shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces and in a Reserve component for a total period of 6 years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such Reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force."

"(i) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 are repealed."

"(j) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word 'twenty-one' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'twenty-four'."

"(k) Section 4 of said act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon the finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all Armed Forces, and uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) elimi-

nating periods of service required under this title."

"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title shall be decreased by any period less than 24 months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title shall be eliminated,

the period of active service of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be."

"(1) Subsection (a) of section 5 of said act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following words: 'And provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President.'

"(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such act is amended by striking out 'the effective date of this title,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 1, 1951.'

"(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such act is amended by inserting after the words 'six months' a comma and the words 'prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the receipt of orders to report for induction.'

"(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such act is amended by inserting after 'subsection (b)' a comma and the following: 'paragraph (1) of this subsection.'

"(n) Subsection (a) of section 6 of said act is amended by inserting the words 'midshipmen, merchant marine reserve, United States Naval Reserve; students enrolled in an officer-procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; immediately following the words 'cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy;'

"(o) Subsection (d) of section 6 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who, (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidate training program established by the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer-procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training: (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), not less than 2 years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the sixth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a Regular or Reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons except those persons who have previously completed an ini-



tial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military service described in subsection (f) under obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed 1 year.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

"(p) Subsection (h) of section 6 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an office (other than an office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further*, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferrable under any other provisions of this act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial

assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board."

"(q) Subsection (i) of section 6 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) (1) Any person who, while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided*, That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (i) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of said Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

"(r) Section 7 of said act is hereby repealed.

"(s) (1) Section 9 (b) (A) (i) is amended to read as follows: 'If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or.'

"(2) Section 9 (b) (B) (i) is amended to read as follows: 'If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or.'

"(3) Section 9 (b) (C) (i) is amended to read as follows: 'If still qualified to perform the duties of such position be restored to such position if it exists and is not held by a person with greater seniority, otherwise, to a position of like seniority, status, and pay; or.'

"(t) Subsection (g) of section 9 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than 4 years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under

honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than 4 years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such 4 years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within 30 days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

"(u) Subsection (a) of section 13 of said act is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the words 'or persons appointed to or serving on the National Selective Service Appeal Board.'

"(v) Section 10 of said act is amended (1) by amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: 'There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President;'; and

"(2) By adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this act; and the number of deferments granted under this act and the basis for such deferments."

"(w) Section 17 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, terminate, or suspend for a stated period of time, all inductions into the Armed Forces.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1954."

"(x) Section 21 of such act is amended (1) by striking out 'July 9, 1951,' inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953,' and (2) by adding the following at the end thereof: 'Any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of 90 days or more in any branch of the Armed Forces

between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, or for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon the completion of 12 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty.

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the act of July 27, 1950 (ch. 501 of the laws of the 81st Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out the words 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'July 1, 1952' and by adding at the end of said section a new sentence as follows: 'No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for 12 months pursuant to this act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this act.'

"(b) Section 7 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953.'

"SEC. 3. Wherever in this amendatory act the period of active service for any category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory act, except members of the Reserve components.

"SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 26, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder: *Provided*, That persons required to register pursuant to this section shall, at the time of such registration, be accorded the right to express a written preference to discharge their obligation for training and service in the Armed Forces in units which are segregated as to race, which preference shall govern any future assignment of such persons, for training and service, insofar as military necessity may permit.'

"SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the '1951 Amendments to the Selective Service Act.'

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ascertain if the substitute offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina is the same as H. R. 3364 introduced on March 20th? If it is, I shall ask that it be printed in the Record at this point without reading it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the language is the same as in that bill, and in view of the fact that the language in that bill was taken from the bill which the gentleman

introduced and which appears in his bill, I have no objection to dispensing with the reading of the substitute at this time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina be printed in the Record at this point without further reading of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] be recognized for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the graciousness of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and if I have the opportunity to do the same thing for him, I shall be glad to do it. I do not have to restate my fondness for the gentleman. You know, we have been wrestling with this problem and I have had no small task in keeping up with the happenings.

When we first started with the bill it was so obnoxious that I could not even point out my objections to the Armed Services Committee in an hour and a half. It was then revised, and it came back to the floor. I still did not like it. I was getting along all right, however, until I began to get a little confused as to what was happening.

My distinguished friend, the chairman, has always employed the tactics, if I may use football terms, of a line buckler or line plunger. When he came into the House he just went through. But this time he adopted the skill and tactics of the Doak Walkers and the Charlie Justices and opened up with end runs and forward passes. I thought I was getting along with that all right, too. But when he employed the old Carlisle Indian hidden-ball trick I thought it was about time to begin to take real notice. And I found he had hidden the ball so well with his amendment that he could not find it himself.

After the amendment was offered, of course I was asked my opinion of it, and I was not at all reluctant to give my opinion. There is no question in my mind as to the purpose of the amendment. It was introduced simply for the reason that it was pretty generally understood the bill as it stood would not be adopted. But whether that be true or not the amendment was offered. Which is an improvement, but still falls short.

I have continued this fight. And in response to the wishes of many, including my own, I have introduced this substitute. I have a very deep conviction about the questions involved. Anyone knowing me knows full well that I do not abandon a conviction. I do not talk very much in the well of the House. The membership has always been kind to me, but I can assure the membership of this House that at no time in my career have I ever made a statement from this well that was not my sincere belief and conviction.

We now have this committee bill, S. 1, which carries what some have referred to as a shell of the universal military training bill. Frankly, I have some difficulty in naming it. I do not know what it is. I know this one thing, that with the exception of the vote that those of us cast when we declared World War II, you have never cast a more important and far reaching vote in this House or one that comes any closer to or affects any more people, and probably could have a good deal to do to change our American way of life as we understand it. That being the case, my friends, I think we should be doubly careful in passing on this piece of legislation.

The substitute that I offer here does this: It takes the draft bill from the combination bill now sponsored by the committee and sets it apart. It changes the age to 19, which is exactly the same age in the existing draft law. It changes the length of service to 24 instead of 26, 24 being the length of service prescribed by the Senate, and 21 months is the present law, and it eliminates the universal military training feature. This is not a fight for or against military training, make no mistake about that. It is whether we approach universal military training with the degree of caution and care and good, cool, calm judgment that we should, or whether we attempt to mix it up and hide it in a bill of this kind. You have the idea that only just a few lines in this bill set up the skeleton of this kind of a makeshift UMT provision—and I would not call it what my friend from Georgia did—but there is something in there, my friends, that is not so easily understood. If you will observe this bill and the sections of it that are marked red, you will find the so-called universal military training provisions throughout the bill. There they are, page after page, page after page, and yet the proponents say that they are marking out all except a little bit.

My friends, at this time we are in a serious situation, and make no mistake about that, and that is not any scarecrow. We all know that. Every child knows that. Why can we not deal with the emergency problem that is now confronting us? Why should we drag in this all-controversial proposition now and not even one-third do the job? Everyone is in favor of a draft bill. Then is it not a good idea to do something at this time that will harmonize with the views of the American people? Is there not enough confusion in this world and in this country at this time without digging up and partially dealing with one of the most controversial issues in this country at this time? Yes; I think so.

Now, they have completely abandoned the argument that they could not raise the men. We have not heard any talk about that recently. I do not know whether this article put the fire out yesterday or not, but I am going to read it to you now. This appeared in the press yesterday, on the 10th:

#### DRAFT CUT LOOMS

The Army is expected to announce a deep cut in its May draft call of 60,000 men—possibly 50 percent—because it already is more than 100,000 over strength, the Pentagon disclosed yesterday. With more than 1,500,000 men—at least 100,000 over its June



30 goal of 1,400,000—the Army has been slowing its intake of draftees.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. They cut the present call down from 80,000 to 40,000.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say this: I do not believe there is a single man in this Hall at this time who honestly and sincerely believes that it is necessary to lower the age to 18½ years in order to raise the number of men to the 3,500,000 they say are necessary. I make that statement on my responsibility as a Member of this House, and I have gone into it pretty thoroughly and I have a lot of figures here that will support that statement. It is their own figures and their own talk, and there is only one reason for putting 18½ in there, and that is to couple the so-called makeshift incomplete universal military training in with it, and they know it. Mrs. Rosenberg virtually said that and General Bradley made virtually the same statement.

This job of coupling these two bills together was brought up in the committee. I disagree with some things that my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], advocates, but I think he is honestly and sincerely in favor of some kind of universal military training bill. I do not know what kind, and I doubt if he does at this time, but he was a very able and strong advocate against pinning these two bills together. He gave General Marshall tough going before the committee because he did not regard it as a wise move. I do not believe he regards it as a very wise move today. I certainly do not call it a wise move.

I say to you in all frankness, I do not know what is in this committee bill. I do not know how it is going to operate, and no one has explained it very clearly. We begin reading on top of page 35 and we find this:

There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (herein called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members—

Then it states in line 18:

At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

You find provisions of that kind all the way through. Then they say it cannot go into operation because they do not have the men, yet you turn over to another page and you find that when the President finds that they do not need certain ages he may invoke it, or it may be done by concurrent resolution.

I do not know whether that is a proper interpretation of it or not, but I say if it confuses me there certainly must be a few Members in this House with as little judgment as I have and certainly they, too, must be equally confused.

We have in the bill the setting of the \$30 pay. What do you want to set the pay for? Why do we want to set the wages? Why do we want to stir up those things in a bill in which we do not finish? Who is it that does not want this Congress to vote on the whole bill at one time, and why?

Yesterday I listened to the lecture about courage, about why we did not do something, and that came from a member of the committee. Possibly that is a little out of turn. If we are going to debate a universal military training bill we should be able to debate a complete universal military training bill, and this House is the place to do it. My argument is that that must be done before the American people will be satisfied with this action.

I am a strong advocate of the 19-year-old provision, yes, but I want to say something right here. I do not know of any one thing in this world, and I speak as one who has experienced close observation, that comes as near to tearing the heartstrings out of a mother as for an 18- or an 18½-year-old boy to be taken. When he grows a little older, then she has faith in his judgment and in his ability to take care of himself. She does not feel it so much. In the case of a mother who let her son go into the last war when he was young, and he now has gone back into this war, 6 years older, there is an entirely different feeling, because she feels that now he has the judgment to sustain him and that he can take care of himself as he goes along.

The bill I have offered is the straight, outright draft bill. We took it from this bill, mind you, by taking a pair of scissors and cutting it out. Why they went to so much trouble to entwine and entangle it I will never know, unless it was put in the bill for the purpose of tying it onto the tail of the kite in the hope that the breeze would be strong enough to take it up.

If it will not pass this body in an hour of cool, calm, and deliberate consideration, when we are dealing with every right of the average boy, then it should not be law. Who are we to allocate unto ourselves all the wisdom that future Congresses may have? Who are we to say that we have more patriotism or more love of this Nation? We have our share I am sure, but certainly no monopoly. I am for national defense. But the so-called UMT provisions in this bill will not add one thing to national defense. All it will do is keep a lot of people over in the Pentagon busy working on it when they ought to be busy doing something worth while.

When we pass my draft bill it will be in effect until 1954. Then we have discharged our duty certainly in that field. If we want to study this UMT program and bring it in for cool, calm deliberation, then we can do it. But I will not confuse my people, I will not mistreat my people, I will not attempt to fool them into thinking that we are not passing something that is going to creep up on them.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. In revising his remarks, the gentleman should not say he is going

to raise it to 19 years. The present draft law is 19 years of age, and the months of service are 21. The gentleman's proposal, however, is to increase it from 21 to 24 months.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right. I reckon that sometimes our tongues do work a little faster than our brains, and that is probably what happened to me.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman's brain and tongue can take care of themselves any time.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, before this watering down amendment was offered, the same gentlemen who proclaimed the virtues of the amendment were here trying to support the original provisions to bring in a commission's report which would be rammed down your necks and which you would not have had an opportunity to amend. Then inch by inch ground is given, and now it is to come in as a privileged resolution. How it will be handled on the floor, heaven knows. They say, "We will work that out." Of course, you will have 1 hour to consider it. Sometimes, who controls the hour and who controls what will be worked out will have a great deal to do with the kind of consideration that you will give the most important piece of legislation and one of the most controversial pieces of legislation in this Nation at this time. I say to you it is an unwise procedure and I believe you will agree with me. Imagine 4 days debate on this bill and probably 1 hour on the real bill itself. It is absurd.

Now we have the provision here where the Armed Services Committee must report in 45 days. At times I have thought perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services should have a Federal law to stop him, but I never dreamed he would advocate a law to hurry him up. I never thought that he would advocate a Federal law to make him do something he is going to do anyway. I do not see any need for that kind of harness on this legislative body, and you do not, either, and we know it is not a very wise action. Would you, since I am chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, would you care for me to turn the same thing over to the Federal Security Agency, or to the Department of Labor that we are asked to turn over here? Certainly not. This is a dangerous precedent. I say to you my sincere concern in this matter springs from my devotion to the educational system of this country. Any universal military service plan that is either proposed or put through must give careful and cautious consideration to the educational system of this country, else we will overlook that great source from which many, and probably a greater part of our contributions have come to promote, sustain, and build up our American way of life, that every man on this globe admires. If you do not believe that they like the American way of life, go to any country across the seas. The chief topic of conversation is how they can get over here. Yet we toy with it, and would write in this skeleton. Then speculate on what will happen. I do not know whether it is just a machine waiting for the gas or whether it is a machine that has the gas and the



spark plugs and does not have a steering wheel. I know one thing—who is that comedian who says, "It don't look right to me"?—and it does not look right to those of us who are serious about this thing.

When you begin to think for one moment that the educators of this country are not alarmed, you are badly mistaken. I alone in the last 5 days have received, I would say, probably 200 letters from college presidents and college administrators, and a stack of letters from school administrators, probably a foot high. They are alarmed. If this country cannot keep building our educational institutions, for goodness sake, let us not take a chance on tearing them down.

I think the merging of these two bills is unfortunate; I think many of the Members think it is unfortunate. It is not an issue between Selective Service and universal military training, or against universal military training—that is not it. I plead with you to adopt the sound and sane and orthodox manner of dealing with one of the most serious problems and one of the most controversial issues. We have enough controversy. I, for one, cannot put our school system and American way of life in jeopardy. Without more facts, and a more complete bill, let us divorce universal military training from the draft bill. Pass my draft bill, which will furnish every man necessary for our national defense according to National Defense Department figures.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Towe: Page 4, line 11, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "And persons inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title shall not be assigned for any duty in Europe in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty unless Congress by concurrent resolution, shall have expressed its approval of the assignment for such duty of the persons so inducted."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TOWE. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. In the consideration of the pending legislation will the original bill S. 1 and the substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina both be subject to amendment? And in the event of the adoption of the substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will it after adoption be subject to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is adopted it will not then be subject to amendment.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered goes to the very heart of one of the vital questions facing the American people today—the extent of the authority of the President of the United States to disperse troops to foreign soil, and in effect, to make war.

I have approached this problem with the utmost care and the deepest thought. These are critical times, and it is imperative that Americans be as united in spirit as possible in the fight against communism. I am convinced that it is incumbent upon us to do nothing that will embarrass General Eisenhower in the delicate negotiations which he has undertaken, nor impair our relations with the free nations of Europe.

Popularly, this issue has become known as the troops-to-Europe question. I think it has been misnamed. I think the question should be rephrased to read "Shall we have a garrison state in America?"

The essence of the problem is to what degree the President of the United States functions as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. Does this authority give him the right to disperse our troops in unlimited numbers to any corner of the globe he pleases? Does this authority give him the right to precipitate us into war when such dispersals are made on the basis of erroneous judgment? Does such authority give him the right to ignore Congress, despite the fact that the Constitution spends only three words conferring this authority upon him, while the much broader powers of the Congress are spelled out clearly and plainly in an entire section of our organic document?

The answer to all these questions is "No."

I do not believe that a single Member of this House, having subscribed in his oath of office to uphold the Constitution, can, as an elective representative of the people, idly stand by and permit the present occupant of the White House to claim any such powers as are now being claimed for him. If we are willing to concede that he has such powers, then obviously we no longer have a republic of freemen, but instead, a garrison state in which one person, the President of the United States, can, by his judgment, whims, or caprice, plunge us into war in any corner of the globe at any time.

That is the fundamental issue. We are faced with the practical fact, however, that the President has already committed certain acts and taken certain steps which go beyond the authority granted him by the Constitution. We are also confronted by the practical fact that General Eisenhower, acting in the best of faith and under orders from the President of the United States, is in Europe conducting negotiations relative to the security of the North Atlantic community.

The amendment I have offered was drafted with the utmost care to give General Eisenhower the free hand that he may need to fulfill his mission. This is accomplished by the fact that the amendment specifically states that—

Persons inducted into the armed services under the provisions of this title shall not be assigned for duty in Europe in implementation of article 3a of the North Atlantic Treaty unless the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall have expressed its approval of the assignment for such duty of the persons so inducted.

This means that all persons in the armed services, either through voluntary enlistment or induction, up to the time that this bill shall become law, namely, June 30, 1951, will be available for service in Europe without referral by the President to Congress. However, those inducted after that period shall not be available for such service unless Congress gives its approval as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

There are more than a million men in our Army alone. The other body has indicated its approval of the dispatch of four additional divisions to Europe without referral to Congress.

My amendment in no way conflicts with the sentiment of the other body. If anything, it goes further in an effort to strike a balance between the necessity to preserve the constitutional functions of our tripartite form of government on the one hand, and the necessity for us to exhibit a spirit of unity behind General Eisenhower and his mission abroad on the other hand.

It should be added, of course, that the main objective is not to prevent assistance which we may feel obligated to give at any time, but to be certain that the number of men who will be required to go abroad in any large number, or the matériel to be furnished will be approved by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, the proper place to write this provision into the law is in this bill. I see no other practical way for the House to act.

Certainly, if it is the opinion of the White House that the constitutional authority exists for the President to send unlimited number of troops anywhere anytime, it is time that this Congress eliminate that opinion by expressly writing into law a limitation on such authority.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman from New Jersey should explain to the committee that the effect of his amendment would be that it would not apply to anyone who volunteers.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.



Mr. VINSON. Therefore, you would have regiments that would be made up of inductees under the bill and volunteers. There would have to be a census or a division of the regiment to see who would be affected by this amendment?

Mr. TOWE. Of course, under the gentleman's interpretation he is stretching it quite a bit. The whole point of the amendment is to make certain that before any large number of troops are committed to Europe after the passage of the law the Congress will be consulted, and I might add to the chairman, for whom I have a great deal of respect, perhaps if that had been done before we got involved in the Korean war we might not be in the position we are in today.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman can find no fault with one being sent to Europe by the President who volunteers?

Mr. TOWE. Yes, I do find fault with it, but there is no way in this bill to stop it. If there were I would be happy to try to do it.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman think the proper way to stop it is by a resolution somewhat along the line that the Senate has passed?

Mr. TOWE. No, I do not think so.

Mr. VINSON. That deals with both of them.

Mr. TOWE. No.

Mr. VINSON. Now here you are in this case of a fix: The inductee cannot go but the volunteer can go. If you are sound in keeping the inductee out why should you not also keep the volunteer out?

Mr. TOWE. If the House adopts this amendment, and I hope it will, I am certain that the President will not send anybody unless he gets the approval of the Congress and I am sure that the Congress will approve reasonable commitments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. I may ask the gentleman, in all fairness, why is not the proper way to debate this, and it is a debatable question—it is an important question, on the resolution that the Senate has just passed which has been referred to the committee that deals specifically with this and applies both to the volunteer and to the inductee?

Mr. TOWE. Of course, the Senate resolution does not have the weight of law. It is merely an advisory opinion.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, the gentleman knows that as far as actual effect is concerned it has the same stability that a law has.

Mr. TOWE. No, I would not say that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that the chairman of the committee to which that resolution has been referred is reported to have announced that it will stay there

forever and never be brought up for consideration?

Mr. TOWE. I do not know.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a fact that in the 1940 extension of the Selective Service Act there was a flat prohibition against sending troops abroad, so that at that time you had the combination of volunteer and draft forces.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct. In this present bill you have a provision that you cannot send anybody in certain age groups inducted under this bill, out of the country for a certain length of time, but you can send young enlistees or volunteers out of the country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to point out the language of the first Selective Service Act which I take it was very much under the control of the very able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] at the time of its enactment. It specifies these words:

Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under this act shall not be employed beyond the limit of the Western Hemisphere except in the Territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I understood the gentleman from Minnesota to say that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Judge KEE, stated that this resolution which has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs would stay there until doomsday. Now, as a matter of fact, I have never heard the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs say that. He has made no such announcement to the committee, and, so far as I know, he has the inclination at the present time to have that resolution considered at the proper time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I said that the chairman was reported to have said that. I read in the public press that he said that.

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not think he did. The chairman is not here, but his conversation with me was certainly not along that line.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad to hear that, because if it is not true I am glad to have the story in the paper corrected.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is it not possible for the gentleman's committee to consider a resolution pending before the committee without the chairman calling it up?

Mr. RICHARDS. Certainly. That is not the usual practice, but it could be done. I am replying to the allegation made by the gentleman from Minnesota that the chairman had taken this position when he has not, from all the information I can get.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has been interrogated as to the possible inconvenience of mixing troops drafted under this law with volunteers. Is it not perfectly true, that none of the troops drafted under this law are permitted by the terms of this bill to go abroad until 6 months after they have been drafted, so that no troops under this bill could go abroad under any circumstances during the period that General Eisenhower has said he wants them—the four divisions, I believe it was.

Mr. TOWE. Four divisions, roughly; that is, until they reach the proper age.

Mr. VORYS. So that even without the gentleman's amendment, this new draft law would not be available to carry out the presently announced plan of our needs abroad, but if this is adopted, it will insure that if there is to be a substantial change in the plans of our leadership for action abroad, that it will require concurrent action by the Congress before these conscripts can be sent abroad, under that new plan.

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman just said, in response to a question by the gentleman from Ohio, that it has no application, we will say, to the four divisions; that is correct, is it not?

Mr. TOWE. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. All right. But it would prohibit any person inducted being sent as a replacement to the four divisions. In other words, if by death or by casualty anything would happen to any of those troops in the four divisions, nobody inducted under this bill, if the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, could be sent to take their place?

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman is correct. While he is on his feet I would like to ask him if he thinks that the President of the United States should have the authority to send troops all over the world without Congress approving it? Will the chairman answer that question?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; I will answer it, and I will tell you what I think about that, because I have not reached this decision right off the cuff. I honestly believe that the Committee on Foreign Affairs should give careful consideration and report that resolution back to the House.

Mr. TOWE. Well, the gentleman has not answered my question. Does the chairman think that the President should send troops all over the world without the approval of the Congress?

Mr. VINSON. I want the Congress to have an opportunity to pass on everything possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Will he answer the question?

Mr. VINSON. I am answering, and I am modest about it. I do not want to dodge the issue, and I do not want the Congress to dodge the issue. I think this concurrent resolution of the Senate ought to be brought here and debated.

The TOWE. The chairman has still not answered my question. That is quite obvious to the membership.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot say yes and I cannot say no.

Mr. TOWE. That is a good answer.

Mr. VINSON. Because we are in this kind of a position.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWE. Wait a minute. I want the chairman to finish his statement.

Mr. VINSON. It may be that it would be a weakening of his strength if he disturbs it too much. I hate to see the strength of America weakened at any time, anywhere.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey addresses itself to the question of the power and authority of the President to send troops wherever he deems it necessary in the interest of national security. I do not agree with the gentleman or any Member of the House who would seek to amend this legislation to require congressional approval to send troops to Europe or anywhere else in the interest of national security. They are at once attempting to read the minds of the masters of the Kremlin and failing to read the Constitution of the United States.

Article II, section 2, of the Constitution asserts that the President shall be "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States." I do not recall that ever before in our history has the authority of the President to command, thus delegated by the Constitution, been questioned. The authority of a field commander to deploy his troops can scarcely be limited, if the commander is to win victory in the field. The authority of the Commander in Chief to deploy his troops cannot be limited to a geographic area.

Whatever the mistakes American generals may have made in the past, whatever mistakes have been made in the current Korean conflict, neither Congress nor the President has presumed to set up rules governing the deployment of troops. The number of troops employed in any campaign or battle—

North Africa, France, Ardennes, North Korea—has always been governed by factors quite different from congressional legislative act. In a world in which the threat to our security may come from almost any direction, it is folly to tell the Commander in Chief how many troops he may send into any theater or battle; or when he may send them. What Congress can say to a general, and what Congress does say when it approves his commission is, "We have faith in your ability in a way to justify our faith." But it is the people themselves, not Congress, who say this to the President.

It is ridiculous, and worse, to presume to tell the Commander in Chief how he is to deploy the troops he commands, it is also ridiculous to assume that the next aggression of the Communist overlords of Europe and Asia will break out in Europe. Why not in India? Why not in Iran? For Congress to enact an amendment governing the deployment of troops to Europe, is as ridiculous as it would be for a householder to ask a single policeman to guard his front door only, leaving the back open to a gang of thieves. No man in the United States, indeed, no man outside the Kremlin knows where communism may strike next, or in what force, or what effort will be required on our part to meet it. What we need is a riot squad, ready for action anywhere.

I cannot believe that the sponsors of so foolish and ridiculous an amendment as this we are considering are interested in doing anything more than creating an embarrassment to the President of the United States.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TOWE. Does the gentleman think the President should have the right to send large land armies any place in the world that he desires to send them?

Mr. PRICE. The founding fathers thought so. They gave him that right in the Constitution.

Mr. TOWE. Of course, they never gave him that right in the Constitution.

Mr. PRICE. They definitely did. I think if the gentleman will read the Constitution he will discover that.

Surely they are ignoring the functions and the prerogatives of the Presidency, and the safeguards established in the Constitution, and operative under the American system. Surely they are proving their ignorance of military strategy and presuming to direct the actions of field commanders as well as of the Commander in Chief. But most tragically, they are displaying a lack of faith in the American system that has served us so well for almost two hundred years. Do they fear the President more than they trust the system and the electorate that has made him Commander in Chief? Do they think that he alone can do what no American President has ever done, or ever presumed to do, and commit us to an untenable situation without the advice of military leaders? Do they think our future as a Nation is threatened more by maintaining unal-

tered the historic functions of the President than by the growth of communism? Do they think that war is played, like football, with a fixed number of men?

Mr. Chairman, there seems to me only one interpretation of this proposed amendment. It is an action taken to embarrass the President, to handicap our military leaders, and to create national security by statute rather than by strength in being.

If war comes, the United States cannot win it alone. We won neither World War I alone, nor World War II. In another war, we would have even fewer allies. And those allies will fight only if we give them hope and confidence.

Those allies will not fight if we tell them that only a limited number of divisions will be sent to them, and that even that limited number will be sent not by the Commander in Chief but by Congress, after prolonged debate. Those allies will not fight against a Russian Army of limitless manpower, certain to overwhelm them, unless they have confidence the United States will support them. But what confidence can they have in us, when we display so little confidence in our own system, our own President, and indeed in ourselves?

Mr. Chairman, the Roman Emperor who fiddled while Rome burned was guilty of no greater offense against the world in which he lived than the Members of this Congress who, by this or any other amendment to this bill, would have us prepare against unlimited aggression with limited effort; or who seek to handicap and embarrass in any way whatsoever those charged with providing the common defense and security of the United States.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I know the position I take will not prove very popular with the Members on my side of the aisle. However, I do want to take this time to make a statement as to what I said on February 26 of this year and which holds good today. Whether we like it or not, we are in the Atlantic Pact. Whether we like it or not, we have already agreed to go to the assistance of any country in the Atlantic Pact, which may be attacked by the Soviet Union or satellites. So we are in—and for your information I did not vote for the appropriation for the Military Defense Assistance Act, but most of you did vote for that appropriation. You then sent General Eisenhower over to work out the Military Defense Assistance Pact program, and it would now appear that what you are trying to do here is the same thing that you are complaining that the President has done to MacArthur. Here is what I said on February 26 this year:

From what I observed and heard while in Europe, there is nothing in the world, as the House well knows, to stop the Soviets from moving to the English Channel as fast as mechanized equipment can take them there if they cared to move.



Now let us assume that they did decide to move to the English Channel, sweep around into North Africa and take the bases there, control the Mediterranean, isolate Yugoslavia, Italy, Greece, and Spain. In view of the fact they now hold Manchuria and China, I estimate they would have 75 percent of the world's population, 60 percent of the world's resources, and there would be two conflicting philosophies of government in the world. We would then be isolated.

Eventually the Soviets would solidify their European gains and what would happen, I hesitate to predict. The prize today, in my estimation, is Europe, not Asia. The Russians want the Ruhr and Saar Valleys. They want the coal and iron and the great industrial productivity and the ingenuity of the European people. And once they get them we are in for trouble.

The Western European countries would be compelled to cooperate. If you have a bayonet in your back you are bound to cooperate.

We will have trouble anyway unless we build strength in Europe and prove to the Russians that we mean business and prove to the European nations that we are going to stand with them in this critical hour.

A year and a half ago the North Atlantic Treaty agreement and the MDAP program were readily accepted. We knew what we were getting into, or we should have known, when we went along with it. We now get down to business to work out this agreement. We pick General Eisenhower, a great American soldier who headed our forces in World War II; a man who commands the respect and admiration of the American people; a great leader; a sound, clear-thinking American, whose patriotism, love of country, and devotion to duty, compelled him to take this difficult assignment of building up the military strength of the European countries.

Let us not emulate Korea in Europe. We walked out on China and Manchuria and turned them over to the Communists. We pulled out of Korea and the Communists moved in. So now we fight our way back in with 50,000 casualties thus far, because certain minds were changed.

Now that we have a bridgehead in Europe and are dug in, we should stay in. From the debate going on, it would appear as though we might pull out; which is exactly what Stalin and company want us to do so they can move, unopposed, into the second greatest industrial area in the world. In a year or so they would be in a position to throw the world into world war III.

The Russians are bluffing and once we prove we are in Europe to stay, they will, in my opinion, back off.

In 1947 I talked with General Clay in Berlin and he said: "We fought our way in, we are dug in, and we are here to stay unless ordered out." If General Clay had been permitted to take an armored train through to Berlin when he wanted to we would never have had the trouble we are having today. The Russians bluffed us and it worked.

Now, we have an example in Korea where the American general is "hogtied" because he has to operate under orders from the United Nations Debating Society which holds endless conferences and discussions, yet can never reach any agreements and have at time humiliated us in the eyes of the nations of the world.

What do we want to do—handcuff General Eisenhower? We send General Eisenhower to Europe to lead and to work out a defense program to insure the freedom of Western Europe, and yet we propose to tie his hands so he is not going to be able to move until we at home, with endless debate, make up our minds what he can and cannot do. In other words we are going to United Nationsize him as was done to General MacArthur.

The Members of the Congress, the various committees of the House and Senate, heard

the general express himself in a very vigorous and honest manner as to what he expects to do. If I recall correctly, he told us he is not going to permit the European countries to take advantage of us; that he is not going to permit these countries to sit idly by while we pump in our money and equipment to help them; that he is going to see to it that they get down to business; and that we get a fair and square deal. I have confidence in him to see that we get that kind of a deal. If, within 6 months or a year, it becomes evident that we are not getting the right kind of a deal, and they are not cooperating and not trying to help themselves, then I think he should be returned to the United States to make further recommendations to us.

The morale of the people of Europe, as pointed out by the general, is improving somewhat, but not to the extent that it should, in my opinion, under the circumstances. I fully realize they have gone through two wars, and it appears to me, at times, that they would rather be occupied than go through another war with its resulting devastation and destruction.

I would say that four divisions in Germany and two divisions in Austria, and no more, would so improve the morale of the European countries that they would respond immediately to the program to be developed by General Eisenhower to build military strength in Europe. If they fail to respond with their manpower and military strength, then we ought to get out and let them go it alone.

At this time I would rather take the position of getting our foot in the door and endeavor to build some military strength in Europe, than have the Russians move in and take over and then later change our minds as we did in Korea and at a terrific cost to fight to get back in.

The Russians, in my opinion, are bluffing and are overestimated. I am satisfied that once we indicate to them that we have made up our minds that we intend to stay in Europe, they will back off. They might not, but in any event we are committed by the Atlantic Treaty to go to the assistance of these countries if the Russians move whether we are isolated here or whether we have a foothold in Europe.

This situation calls for some bold, courageous moves. Make peace with Japan, rearm Japan, give the Turks—with their million troops—all the armaments and equipment that we can, give Germany equality and permit them to build their own military strength under their own supervision; strengthen Spain and rearm the 400,000 infantrymen there. Spain is anti-Communist and they will fight; give additional help to Yugoslavia immediately, and take Spain, Greece, and Turkey into the North Atlantic Pact set-up. Build our program on strength and not on weakness. All these moves would indicate to the Russians that we mean business. We have been pushed around long enough.

Since we appear to have gotten down to cases, let us not handcuff General Eisenhower. Let him look the situation over before we restrict him. If we have not confidence in him, we had better keep him home. I am willing to go another mile with him. Give him our moral support and help and if, in a reasonable time, it does not work out, let us take another look as to what is happening. At least give him a chance until the European countries indicate what they are going to do.

These four to six additional divisions for Europe would be a great moral factor in world affairs. We must also remember that if we were alongside the Russian border as Germany is today, we would want some protective screen while we were building our armed strength. Other than that, they realize it would be national suicide. They would just be purged and exterminated, wiped out,

so there is a little hesitancy on the part of all the European countries to step out.

However, if we do our part now and let General Eisenhower take over without shackles, and come back in 6 or 8 months and tell us what he thinks, I am satisfied the general will do as he has stated he would do. And that is, if I recall correctly, to see that we get a fair, square deal. If it should be anything else, I feel certain he would not stand for it.

I fully realize we have been taken for plenty in European affairs, but not with my vote; however, I am willing at this time to go just a bit further with General Eisenhower leading to see what he can do to bring stability and peace to a war-torn world.

This so-called great debate has put fear into the hearts of the European countries as to whether or not we will stand with them when the time comes. The more we air this matter, the more difficult we are making the task for General Eisenhower.

If we believe in him, believe in ourselves, have faith that we are right in our cause, a resolution should be offered that this Nation intends to live up to the Atlantic Pact agreement which we have entered into; that we intend to support General Eisenhower, within reason, to the fullest extent of our ability to do so; set our minds to the task before us; have less talk and more action; take off our coats and go to work as we did in World War II to build our national defense and indicate to the Soviets that the liberty-loving people of the world are determined to live in peace and freedom.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I shall in the 5 minutes at my disposal try to contribute something further to the debate. I rise in support of the Barden substitute.

I think as has been so well stated by the gentleman from North Carolina himself [Mr. BARDEN] and others, that this is one of the most important decisions that we in Congress will be called upon to make in many years because of the effect of this legislation on our way of life.

I spoke the other day relative to the point that this is not only a universal military training bill but also that it is legislation that will establish a national service program.

There are many Members here today who did not hear me last Friday, so I will repeat some of the testimony given before Senate and House committee hearings relative to thinking on a national service program.

I want to recall a statement by Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, before the Senate committee in reply to questions as to conscription under this legislation for nonmilitary duty. Her reply was:

It is his (the President's) concept, and that of the Department of Defense, that this must be a universal program and that every man physically and mentally and morally capable of performing a service, either in the military or outside, must perform that service. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

Mrs. Rosenberg explained that she was talking about those men who would be left after they had drafted all those capable of only limited duty military service. She estimated, incidentally,

that the number liable for nonmilitary service would be from 100,000 to 150,000 annually.

Then she said:

We, however, want to make sure—and that is not the Department of Defense's program, but I know those are the President's instructions—that when a program is submitted to you it will not be a made-work program, but one of real usefulness to the national effort. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

Still further on she said in answer to a question as to the program:

The President will have a program. (Senate hearings, p. 148.)

Subsequently Labor Secretary Tobin was asked if he agreed with the program for nonmilitary service for 18-year-olds, and he said:

It would be a very difficult program to administer, and I would want to have an opportunity to see a specific plan before me before I would want to commit myself. (Senate hearings, p. 340.)

Dr. Karl T. Compton, who we all know has been an enthusiastic supporter of "really universal service," told the committee that he believed the plans proposed by the Defense Department "are aimed in that direction"—that is, in the direction of such universal service, military and nonmilitary—Senate hearings, page 436.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer one more quotation from the Senate hearings, and I hope you will pay particular attention to this. Another witness came to the same conclusion and announced his complete and violent disapproval. He was James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO. He told the Senate committee:

We believe that a change in the title to "Universal Military Training and Service" will leave the door open to the drafting of individuals not qualified for military duty to perform functions normally carried on by civilians. To this we are unalterably opposed. (Senate hearings, p. 1051.)

Mr. Chairman, last Friday I said that General Marshall is seeking a beachhead to put over this program. This Vinson bill is the beachhead.

If we are to prevent him from gaining that beachhead, we must adopt the Barden substitute.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Towe amendment should have the firm support of every Member of this body on both sides of the political aisle. It has but one purpose and only one—to give the American people a direct voice on the question whether American troops are to be sent abroad to be integrated into an international army under the North Atlantic Pact.

The people's right to participate in the decision—that is the issue and the sole

issue which the pending amendment presents. All other questions are secondary or collateral.

We are not now called upon to debate whether Russia and her satellites constitute a threat to our national security. No one denies this threat. We are not now called upon to debate whether a free Europe is important to us in resisting this threat to our national safety. No one denies its importance.

By this amendment no question is now being raised as to the value of the North Atlantic Pact or to what extent and by what means it should be implemented. Nor is any question now being raised by this amendment whether American troops should be stationed in Europe, whether 4 divisions, 6, 10, or 12.

These are secondary or collateral questions subsequently to be decided once, by adopting the pending amendment, we have determined the primary question that the people shall participate.

The amendment we have before us should be supported by both the proponents and the opponents of the proposed Atlantic Pact program. Even the most ardent advocates of putting American troops in a European international army should support this amendment. It seeks to do nothing more than to guarantee to the people a voice in this historic decision through their representatives in Congress.

The large volume of mail each of us has received on this subject in recent weeks clearly indicates that the people want to have a voice on this all-important matter. Every national poll of public opinion I have seen indicates the same thing.

I am not a lawyer. And I do not intend to engage in any legalistic argument whether or not the President has authority under our Constitution to take the step he proposes without authorization from Congress.

The President claims he has such authority as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. On the other hand, section 8 of article I of the Constitution very clearly sets forth in successive paragraphs that it is the Congress which has the power "to declare war," "to raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," and "to make the rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

I suppose it is impossible to draw a hard and fast line, as in most constitutional questions, as to where the authority of the Congress ends and the power of the President begins. But I think we can all agree that, at the very best, the authority asserted by the President is questionable. It is most unfortunate that the President should stubbornly stand upon what he conceives to be his constitutional rights and refuse to permit the Congress to participate with him in this decision. In taking this position he callously disregards his assurances to the Congress, when the North Atlantic Pact was ratified, that the Congress would have a direct voice in the implementation of the treaty.

But even assuming that the President's constitutional power to take the step he proposes were beyond any question, it

would more likely make for the success of the program if he would automatically, on his own initiative, ask the Congress to participate with him on deciding the course to be followed in our national self-interest. When our national leaders refuse to allow the people any voice whatever in such a program of such far-reaching importance, it can hardly be expected that the people will gladly give their united support, and make whatever sacrifices may be necessary, for the success of the program. By following the course which the President has unfortunately decided upon, he is dividing the country at the very time when national unity is a paramount need.

By this amendment we are not seeking to deny the President any powers that may be rightfully his. We are not seeking to repudiate any treaty obligation. We are simply seeking to demonstrate that in the United States we have a government not of one man, or a few men, but a government of all the people.

If this amendment is adopted and enacted into law, the Congress can then promptly proceed to act upon such authorization legislation as it may deem necessary and advisable for carrying out the program in question. It is beyond my understanding how the free representatives of the free people of this country can possibly oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has quoted from the Constitution. I want to quote from the Supreme Court in the case of *United States v. Williams* (302 U. S. 46):

The power of Congress (under this clause for regulating the land and naval forces) to determine how armies shall be raised, whether by voluntary enlistment or forced drafts, the age at which the soldier shall be received, and the period for which he shall be taken, the compensation he shall be allowed, and the service to which he shall be assigned is plenary and exclusive.

That is the Supreme Court of the United States talking, interpreting the Constitution.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Would the gentleman agree with me in this? In adopting this amendment we will make it possible for the President to go to war with the advice and consent of the Congress. We will make it impossible for future Presidents to make war as they have done in the past.



Mr. ARENDS. Absolutely. That is the very point.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I often find it difficult to defend the constitutional powers of the President, and possibly that feeling is more tense and pronounced at this moment than at any time heretofore, but I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the members of this committee fully realize the meaning of what is here proposed.

I think the President should live closer to the Congress, both the House and the Senate, and that the situation which culminated in the resolution adopted by the Senate some few days ago might have been avoided if the President had exercised himself in the interest of maintaining a better relationship with that body. But whether he did so or not, I know in my own heart that the resolution was a terrible mistake, and here it is proposed that this body repeat in effect what the Senate did.

The decision of the Supreme Court quoted by my friend from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has no bearing whatever upon the question of the right of the President as the Commander in Chief to place men in the armed services at the point he in his judgment as Commander in Chief believes advisable. Nobody will contend that in the absence of a declaration of war on the part of the Congress it would be within the right of the President to engage the country in war, but whether at war or at peace, it is within his constitutional power to move people in the Armed Forces in such manner as his judgment dictates to be wise. However, this is a power that he should not exercise in defiance of congressional will. On all such matters of grave importance the President should consult the Congress.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Would my friend say that the prohibition in the draft law of 1940 against sending draftees overseas was an unconstitutional prohibition?

Mr. COX. I would say it was an infringement upon the constitutional powers of the President, and that he was not compelled to obey it. Of course, we must assume that the President would not send troops to other parts of the world, in the absence of a declaration of war, where such action might involve us in war. But for the implementation of treaties I think that within the limits of reason he might properly exercise such power. I would say, perhaps, that the fulfillment of our engagements entered into with Western Europe is reasonable. Do not gentlemen realize that we have lost China, Formosa included, and that we will probably lose all of Asia? We are desperately battling now to develop the strength of Western Europe which may be used as an adjunct to our own power. To develop the strength of the great peoples of that part of the world with whom we can make common cause in the endeavor to

hold back the tide of communism that threatens to engulf the entire world.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. Do I understand the gentleman is stating to the House that we are not now engaged in a war in Korea?

Mr. COX. Of course we are in a war in Korea; yes.

Mr. TOWE. Was it declared by the Congress?

Mr. COX. No; it was not declared by the Congress. It is unfortunate that it did develop. However, it may be a situation which nobody could possibly have avoided.

But, Mr. Chairman, returning to the amendment which we are now considering, I beg gentlemen who declare allegiance to the fundamental law of the land to ponder well this question before voting for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee, When does he anticipate closing debate?

Mr. VINSON. I hope that after probably half an hour more of debate we may be in a position to get the acquiescence of the Committee to agree to a limitation of time. We do not want to shut any Member off. After consulting with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, who is now about to address the Committee, if he wants to run on a little bit longer, all right, let everybody have a chance to talk.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are some 374 Members who desire 3 or 4 minutes to talk on the matter. We do not want to be cut off later on.

Mr. VINSON. No; we will never cut the gentleman from Michigan off. He will get the time anyhow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was just thinking of some of the other Members.

Mr. VINSON. I think if we proceed now, we may make some progress.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have given this matter a great deal of serious thought. I realize full well that the developments of last night, as they affect our situation in the Pacific, and as they affect our national welfare, perhaps overshadow in immediate interest many of the other issues involved in this legislation now before us.

However, may I point out that in my opinion the events which have happened in the Pacific in the last 24 hours and the things that have happened there

leading up to the events of the last 24 hours impress upon this amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey a greater importance than it might otherwise have ever assumed.

We are now in a war in the Pacific. We are in a war which the decision to enter was not a matter of participation by the Congress of the United States. For a long time things did not go very well there, and then they went a little better. Apparently, some folks think now that they are going too well—I do not know. But in any event it seems as if we are getting ready to pull out of Asia, or at least go into neutral. Would that not indicate that possibly the Congress should have been consulted before we went into Korea? Possibly a little debate here would not have been a bad thing. Possibly the understanding of the people about why we were there might have been a little clearer, and it might not have been necessary for a young man in the service to write to the Secretary of State to ask why we were in the war in Korea. I served a little time in a war once myself, and I never found it necessary to inquire as to why we were in that war.

We are talking about troops to Europe. General Eisenhower has been named supreme commander. Are we to understand from what has just happened to General MacArthur that if General Eisenhower and his military leaders should come to certain decisions about how best to fight and win in Europe if war there should come, that he will likewise be removed from his command? We had better find out about some of those things before we go very much further.

For myself I want General Eisenhower to feel free to tell the American people whatever he thinks they ought to be told in respect to the way we can defend ourselves and our security best.

The gentleman from Georgia says we lost China.

We did not lose China; the administration gave China away.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me? I accept the correction.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to see the gentleman is regaining some of his good sense.

There is another basic question involved, and right here is where we ought to make a start. The Congress of the United States, I think, is entitled to be advised from time to time by our military leaders. We put up the men and the money with which they fight, and I think we ought to be advised. So, let us be advised about this great new venture before we get into it too far. As I say, I have given this a lot of thought and I want to tell you what I have prepared here is as complete an answer to the gentleman from Georgia as it would have been had I known what the gentleman was going to say.

The Congress of the United States, operating under its constitutional obligation, is now engaged in the enterprise of providing for the common defense of this Nation and its people.

This defense is being raised against the possible encroachment of a government ruled from the top.

To suggest that this Congress should not participate in a major decision involving that defense is to deny the very principle of government by the people which our present effort is designed to protect and uphold.

I have always acted under, and been guided by, the basic assumption that ours is a representative form of government, that what distinguished America from so many other less fortunate nations of the world was our constitutional privilege of making vital decisions as a people—through our Representatives in the Congress—after honest and forthright debate.

To me the great distinguishing feature of our form of government has been the fact that the conduct of our affairs has its origin on the broad base of the people, in sharp contrast to those governments which are ruled from the top down. It is high time that feature was reemphasized.

Now, however, we are facing another major departure from this fundamental precept: It is proposed that the administrative branch of the Government shall on its own initiative, by its own judgment and through its own action embark on an adventure unprecedented in the history of our Nation: The dispatch of American troops to the frontiers of Europe to participate in the establishment of a continental army in a time of nominal, if not official, peace.

In recent weeks the Congress has been engaged in what the press has aptly termed "The great debate."

In all the arguments I have read and heard incident to the current debate in no case has anyone challenged the constitutional right of the Congress to declare war. No one has suggested that there is any ambiguity whatsoever in article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution which sets out in unequivocal terms that the Congress shall have power to declare war.

Does anyone here contend that the framers of the Constitution intended that such power should be a purely academic aftermath of Executive action? Was the historic role of the Congress meant to consist of an accessory after the fact?

Let me recall to you the words of James Madison, our fourth President who said, commenting on the work of the Constitutional Convention:

The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone to it. It has, accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war in the legislature.

I submit that it was precisely because the matter of troop deployment is so closely allied to the power of declaring war that the Congress was given iron-clad assurances by the administration, during the Senate discussion of the proposed Atlantic Pact arrangement, that acceptance of this treaty would in no way involve this country in a commitment of troops.

The answer to a straightforward question on that score, you will recall, was the unqualified—the absolute—no.

Now, however, the administration is proposing to take the very step the people of this Nation were assured would not be taken. The administration is proposing to send Armed Forces to the continent of Europe without the prior authorization of the Congress. These troops are being sent in contemplation of combat. And combat is war.

Let me ask this question: With American combat troops on the continent of Europe what happens if an aggressor attacks a European nation not signatory to the Atlantic Pact? What happens if an aggressor attacks Turkey or moves on Yugoslavia? Does anyone contend that the President could commit our Armed Forces, stationed on the Continent—to the protection of such nations without a declaration of war by the Congress? Does anyone want to predict that he wouldn't?

We must face up to the fact that we are living in a time when a declaration of war has become an old-fashioned device in the minds of many. Wars today culminate in shooting after a step-by-step process in which the representatives of the people are being increasingly euchred into impotence.

The founders of this Nation realized full well the grave implications of a declaration of war; that the power to make such a declaration—a move which plunges any nation into the darkness of death and destruction—should never be vested in a single man.

Is it conceivable, then, that in placing this great responsibility on the shoulders of the Congress, the framers of our Constitution meant that the Congress should exercise no authority in that great twilight zone between peace and war? Was the Congress meant to sit idly by, waiting for the darkness of conflict to fall?

The issue before us is simple: Shall the Congress abdicate its historic and constitutional right and obligation to make major decisions affecting the lives and resources of the people it has been elected to represent? Shall momentous decisions be usurped by the executive branch of the Government, leaving to the Congress purely academic powers of providing the wherewithal in men and money to carry out the designs and adventures of the administration, whatever they may be?

Can anyone here deny that the issue of sending American ground forces to the frontiers of occupied Germany constitutes a decision which can have far-reaching effects on the history of this Nation?

Can anyone here deny that once units of our Armed Forces have been dispatched to the continent of Europe on executive initiative the position of the Congress in making whatever subsequent decisions may necessarily result will henceforth be prejudiced by our very abdication of responsibility in this initial step?

Certainly the easiest course for us to follow today would be to turn our backs

on the grave responsibility of participating in the decision of sending troops to Europe.

The easiest course for us would be to say, "the administration is willing to do this thing on its own initiative. The President says he has the authority to send troops to Europe. It is none of our affair. Let him answer to the people for this action."

That would be the easy way. But it would not be the honorable way. It would not be worthy of a man or woman sworn to perform the duties of the office to which he was elected.

Our position demands that we participate in this decision. For every argument that can be mustered in support of the administration's contention that the authority is vested in the executive office, an equally sound argument can be submitted in support of the contention that the Congress has a like authority. This fact has been amply demonstrated in the debates which have taken place in recent weeks.

It is a fundamental error to base our position purely on the technical aspects of this situation.

A far greater and vastly more important consideration lies in the moral implications of the argument over authority.

Wrapped in those moral implications are great traditions, the fundamental issues of unity, of popular support, of public conviction, all of which are derived through consent of the governed. How else is such consent achieved in our Government except through action by the elected representatives of the people? How else does anyone in this Chamber believe it can be achieved? And how else would anyone in this Chamber today have it achieved?

Casting aside the purely technical aspects of the question, it can be safely stated that no President should be required to make a decision of this magnitude on his own; no President should want to make a decision of this gravity on his own; and, finally, no President should be allowed to make it on his own.

Moreover, beyond the technical issue of authority, we may fairly ask: For what reason does the Executive insist that the collective judgment of the representatives of the people should not be allowed to pass on the question of sending American troops to Europe?

If the reply is that the administration has no faith in the collective judgment of the Congress, then this is a stark condemnation of the American form of government.

If I am asked, in return, why the Congress does not have faith in the administration's judgment on this issue, my answer is that many heads are better than one, and that it is my honest belief that the people of the United States today place more confidence in the judgment of the Congress than in the judgment of the administration. And in support of that contention I submit that on this specific matter a public-opinion poll has established striking statistics indicating that a preponderance of citizens



believe that the troops-to-Europe issue should be resolved by the Congress.

If, on the other hand, the administration insists that time is of the essence in this matter of troops to Europe, I submit that at no time in the history of this Nation has the Congress failed the people in a crisis. It will not do so now.

Today the United States is involved in complex international procedures and relationships.

This Nation is involved in what has been variously described as a "police action," "hostilities," "defense against aggression," and "undeclared war" against the people of North Korea and Communist China.

In this adventure we are presently arrived at what is perhaps best described as a military-diplomatic stalemate, in which no one seems to know what is to be done next. We find our forces, under American leadership, constricted by foreign intrigue and frustrated by diplomatic incompetence.

Operating under the auspices of the United Nations on one front, we are simultaneously embarking on an adventure linked to the Atlantic Pact, an adventure involving the creation and maintenance of a standing international army on the Continent of Europe in a situation for which there is no precedent in our history.

Can any Member deny, after reading his mail from home, that we are in a period of public apprehension and confusion, much of which can be traced to the assumption of authority by the Executive—authority which led to secret deals at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam; authority which plunged this Nation into an undeclared war in Korea; a war, by the way, which has developed into a situation serious far beyond the expectations of an administration which called it a police action?

I will not contend that the executive power of the United States Government shall not be vested in the President, or that in the matter of convenience and facility there may conceivably be occasions when the administration may properly conduct foreign relations.

But I reject as inimical to the best interests of this Nation a trend toward government by Executive interpretation or by political expediency on issues of such grave import as we are now considering. I reject as dangerous to the welfare of our country government by Executive fiat which calls upon the Congress to follow up an administration fait accompli with the docile subservience of a servant to his master. It is high time, I say, that the Congress look to a restoration of its rightful responsibilities and prerogatives as a vital and independent branch of this Government.

I reject, as completely foreign to our traditions, government from above, government by Executive decision; government, if you please, by whim of the White House.

I do not propose to willingly abdicate what I consider to be my sacred responsibility in this regard. As a Member of the Congress of the United States I call upon those of like mind to join me in the per-

formance of our sworn duties to provide for the common defense and to preserve and protect the Constitution of the United States.

I call upon you to join me in the restoration of congressional authority in deciding matters of grave import to the Nation.

I will support the Towe amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Towe amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock, with 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] during his remarks said that the people put more confidence in the Congress than in the President.

During the Civil War, reading the current history of those days, there were very few people who had confidence in President Lincoln. I remember history saying that General McClellan challenged the civil government and the President of the United States at that time. I remember history showing that President Lincoln visited the home of General McClellan in Washington. General McClellan was out attending a wedding and the President and the Secretary of War waited for General McClellan to return to his residence. Some time later General McClellan did return, and his servant told him that President Lincoln and the Secretary of War were waiting to talk to him; and General McClellan went upstairs, passed the room in which Lincoln was seated; that a half hour later President Lincoln asked the servant if General McClellan was going to see him, and the servant told him that General McClellan had retired for the night; that Lincoln then left and went back to the White House.

I remember history telling that very few Members of Congress supported Lincoln in those days. Lincoln was crucified in those days, but Lincoln's Memorial now stands as a shrine, and properly so, to which hundreds of thousands of people make a pilgrimage each year, because Lincoln now is identified as the savior of the Union.

So I think a little reference to history pointedly answers the observation made by my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, in that respect. We see history made today of 435 Americans, each of us elected by the people of our congressional districts, with a direct responsibility imposed upon us in these trying days to do those things as Americans that will be for the best interest of our country, not only today but tomorrow. It is not what we like to do but what we should do. We should face the problems with courage. We should face the issues of the day with confidence and with courage, and we should do those things and cast those votes for issues that will

be for the best interests of the United States of America without fear or without regard to personal consequences politically. I have to live with my conscience and you have to live with yours, and all I can say is that so far as JOHN McCORMACK's conscience is concerned, I am going to vote on the side of strength for my country. For I am satisfied that there is only one thing that the Communists respect, and that is what they fear, and the only thing they fear is a strength and power greater than they possess.

Three years ago I made a speech calling attention to the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union operating under the ideology of international communism, taking over country after country through internal subversion, the ultimate objective being the United States of America. We can have peace in the world very easily if we want to; there is nothing in the world to stop us from having peace. We do not have to appropriate one penny and we do not have to take one young man from his home. My two brothers and I left our home in World War I and enlisted as privates. We do not have to make any sacrifices. All we have to do is get down on our knees to Stalin. But what a life afterward? We can live if we want to become slaves, but we have to do those things that our judgment tells us we must do if we want to remain freemen and free women.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, first I want to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that it must be terrible to be born a rascal and then be handicapped with a conscience.

I find myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Georgia, which always causes me to reexamine my thinking.

There has been much reference to history today. History has demonstrated through all the years that any confederacy of nations that has no power is dangerous to all those that belong to it. Such confederacy will destroy even its largest member. For that reason our original Confederacy of 13 States was inadequate. Our Constitution was necessary to provide uniform money, an Army, control of interstate commerce, effective foreign policy, and other subjects.

Our Government of necessity was given definite and necessary powers. We divided those powers among branches of that Government. We expressly said Congress was to have the right to declare war and the President all powers necessary to a Commander in Chief. History told us we had to do that even though there might be a conflict in those powers. However, Mr. Chairman, I call your attention that history has also told us that the same agency that declares war must raise the taxes to finance the war. To provide otherwise is to expressly provide for the eventual destruction of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., reported to the President of the

United States upon completion of the San Francisco Conference, where the United Nations was set up. He told the President in his letter that they had set up a beautiful freeman's legislature, but it had no power to make laws. He said they set up a beautiful court that history advised necessary for freemen, but that the court they set up had no jurisdiction. He then said they set up a Security Council in which 99.99 percent of the members could not act. That was the United Nations. It is a new confederacy without powers. The American people accepted it through their legislature because if it had no powers, there was no need to discuss the extent of the designated sovereignty to the United Nations from our Government.

Even though it had no powers, we find ourselves at war in Korea because that new government agency—United Nations—without the power to tax, was assumed by our President to have the power to declare war for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we must face the fact. That division of our Government which must finance war must insist upon its right to declare war and at least limit the number of men that a President may send outside of our borders without the consent of Congress. If we follow any other pattern today, Congress will either eventually say to the men across the oceans in foreign lands that we in this House cannot or will not finance a military expedition entered into by another department of our Government. For that reason, I submit to you that we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey and insist that the Congress has something to say on the subject of whether or not our troops shall leave our shores, and if so in what numbers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to analyze objectively the position taken by the Republican Party in proposing to restrict the President's power as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and so to obstruct and hamper him in the execution of the military and foreign policy of the United States of America. The arguments fall into three categories: First, those arguments based on the Constitution; second, the arguments from precedent; third, the argument from principle, or what may be called the principle of limitation and restraint upon the Presidential power in the conduct of foreign affairs and in command of the armed services.

Let us consider first the contention of Republicans that the President does not have the constitutional power to send troops to Europe in the present situation. They do not raise any question as to the power of the Chief Executive to dispatch troops outside the United States and its territories in time of war, but they do question and are questioning his right to send them in time of peace or of undeclared war. In raising this question

they are in disagreement with the great majority of recognized constitutional authorities, including William Howard Taft, once Republican President of the United States.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very pertinent, at this point, to read into the RECORD a very significant statement. Ex-President William Howard Taft, a Republican President and former Chief Justice of the United States of America, in his book *The Presidency—Its Duties, Its Powers, Its Opportunities and Limitations* had this to say:

The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and of the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this, he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will. Of course, the instrumentality which it furnishes gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. Under the Constitution Congress has the power to declare war, but with the Army and Navy the President can take action, such as to involve the country in war and to leave Congress no opinion but to declare it, or to recognize its existence.

He made that statement at the University of Virginia before young men studying in the field of constitutional law.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, Taft in his work entitled "Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers" expressed his opinion in these words:

The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. \* \* \* Under this, he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation. \* \* \* The instrumentality which this power furnishes, gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect. (William Howard Taft, *Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers*, p. 94.)

Another expert, W. W. Willoughby, in his book, *The Constitutional Law of the United States*, expresses a similar opinion, which is typical of the opinions of outstanding United States constitutional authorities. On the question of the right of the President to send troops, Professor Willoughby writes this:

It would seem to the author, however, that the President, under his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and his general control of the foreign relations of the United States, has this discretionary right constitutionally vested in him, and, therefore, not subject to congressional control. (W. W. Willoughby, *The Constitutional Law of the United States* (2d ed.), vol. III, p. 1567.)

Dr. Willoughby contends positively that if the sending is in pursuance of express treaty provisions or for the execution of treaty provisions, the sending could not reasonably be subject to constitutional objections. Significantly, no prominent Republican is calling for renegotiation of North Atlantic Treaty.

The argument based on precedent need not detain us long. The record shows that in the 175 years of the existence of

the United States, American troops have been sent abroad in approximately 150 separate instances. Following is a brief outline of a few of such instances.

1798-1800—Undeclared naval war with France: This contest included land actions, such as that in the Dominican Republic, city of Puerto Plata, where marines captured a French privateer under the guns of the forts.

1801-5—Tripoli: The First Barbary War, including the *George Washington* and *Philadelphia* affairs and the Eaton expedition, during which a few marines landed with United States Agent William Eaton to raise a force against Tripoli in an effort to free the crew of the *Philadelphia*. Tripoli declared war but not the United States.

1816-18—Spanish Florida: First Seminole war: The Seminole Indians, whose area was a resort for escaped slaves and border ruffians, were attacked by troops under Generals Jackson and Gaines and pursued into northern Florida. Spanish posts were attacked and occupied. British citizens executed. There was no declaration or congressional authorization but the Executive was sustained.

1818—Oregon: The U. S. S. *Ontario*, dispatched from Washington, landed at the Columbia River and in August took possession. Britain had conceded sovereignty but Russia and Spain asserted claims to the area.

1846-48—Mexico: President Polk occupied disputed territory. Precipitated Mexican War.

1853-54—Ryukyu and Bonin Islands: Commodore Perry on three visits before going to Japan and while waiting for a reply from Japan made a naval demonstration, landing marines twice, and secured a coaling concession from the ruler of Naha on Okinawa. He also demonstrated in the Bonin Islands. All to secure facilities for commerce.

China: In 1927, the United States had 5,670 troops ashore in China and 44 naval vessels in its waters. In 1933 we had 3,027 armed men ashore. All this protective action was in general terms based on treaties with China ranging from 1858 to 1901.

1914—Dominican Republic, June and July: During a revolutionary movement, United States Naval Forces by gunfire stopped the bombardment of Puerto Plata, and by threat of force maintained Santo Domingo City as a neutral zone.

1918-20—Soviet Russia: Marines were landed at and near Vladivostok in June and July to protect the American consulate and other points in the fighting between the Bolshevik troops and the Czech Army which had traversed Siberia from the western front. A joint proclamation of emergency government and neutrality was issued by the American, Japanese, British, French, and Czech commanders in July and our party remained until late August.

In August the project expanded. Then 7,000 men were landed in Vladivostok and remained until January 1920, as part of an allied occupation force.

1919—Honduras, September 8 to 12: A landing force was sent ashore to main-



tain order in a neutral zone during an attempted revolution:

1926-33—Nicaragua, May 7 to June 5, 1926; August 27, 1926, to January 3, 1933: The coup d'état of General Chamorro aroused revolutionary activities leading to the landing of American marines to protect the interests of the United States. United States forces came and went, but seem not to have left the country entirely until January 3, 1933. Their work included activity against the outlaw leader Sandino in 1928.

1941—Germany: Sometime in the spring the President ordered the Navy to patrol ship lanes to Europe. By July our warships were convoying and by September were attacking German submarines. There was no authorization of Congress or declaration of war. In November the Neutrality Act was partly repealed to protect military aid to Britain, Russia, and so forth.

Even Senator TAFT admits to these facts, for, as he says:

Many cases have been cited, because the President has actually landed troops in many countries in the past.

He argues, however, that the action has been taken in every case to protect American citizens or American property. He says, further, that in no case can the President "ever involve this country in war unless it is attacked." This statement does not square with the facts. Rather it is true, as Republican Senator MILLIKIN stated in a speech in the Senate of the United States in 1945:

In many cases the President has sent troops into a foreign country to protect our foreign policy, notably in Central and South America. This was not aimed at protecting any particular American citizen. It was aimed at protecting our foreign policy.

Certainly in no case of our intervention in South America and Central America, excepting Mexican involvements, was there any attack on the United States, and in most cases there was involvement in war, although on a small scale. Professor Corwin, in his book, *The President: Office and Powers*, summarizes this case thus:

It may be argued, and has, in fact, been argued many times, that the President is under constitutional obligation not to incur the risk of war in the prosecution of a diplomatic policy without first consulting Congress and getting its consent. In view, nevertheless, of what has been said already, the supposed principle is clearly a maxim of policy rather than a generalization from consistent practice. (E. S. Corwin, *The President: Office and Powers*, p. 249.)

It is clear that the Republican case cannot be defended on constitutional grounds, neither is it sustained by the record of history. This leaves then the argument based on the so-called principle of the limitation of the Presidential power as Commander in Chief and as Chief Executive, with wide powers in the conduct of foreign affairs. What is actually implied in this demand is that the President secure congressional approval for the sending of troops, is that Congress is claiming the right to a veto power over the President's determinations as Commander in Chief, at least whenever commitment of troops outside the

United States is at issue. I assume that this would also include any proposal to dispatch the Navy.

The Republicans are here contending for a drastic limitation upon the power of the President in military and international affairs. This is certainly contrary to the Republican tradition. A reexamination of the record of history will show that the Republican Presidents have usually demonstrated great independence and autonomy in these two fields, military activity and foreign affairs.

Abraham Lincoln, for example, without congressional authorization, called out the militia, called for volunteers, increased the size of the Regular Army and Navy, suspended the writ of habeas corpus in certain areas and spent \$2,000,000 of unappropriated funds—page 18, committee print, printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Only after all of these acts had been carried out did Congress pass an act, signed on August 6, 1861, approving and legalizing "all the acts, proclamations, and orders of the President, respecting the Army and Navy and calling out, or relating to the militia or volunteers from the States"—McLaughlin, *Constitutional History of the United States*, page 662.

Garfield, on the other hand, ordered the occupation troops out of the South. This action was a reversal of policy established by the Congress, as a major policy. Yet the Republican Congress permitted this order to be carried out without launching a great debate.

Again in 1900-1901 Republican President McKinley sent 5,000 troops to fight in conjunction with the troops of other nations to put down the Boxer Rebellion. China considered this a war, and declared war. Yet no great debate was launched to clarify the principle. Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States says:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Yet for 4 years, 1898 to 1902, the President as Commander in Chief exercised all the executive power and all legislative power of the Government. Congress, a Republican Congress, permitted this, and when it did act, after the act, it ratified everything President McKinley had done—Taft, *Our Chief Magistrate*, pages 98, 99.

Another Republican President Theodore Roosevelt, in the conduct of foreign affairs relative to securing the Panama Canal sent marines who prevented Colombian troops from stopping the revolution in Panama, without congressional approval. In his own words he described his own independence of the Republican Congress.

I took Panama—

He said in 1912.

It was the only way the canal could be constructed. If I had followed traditional conservative methods I should have submitted a dignified state paper of probably 200 pages to Congress and the debate would be going on yet. But I took the Canal Zone and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on the Canal does also. (Nevins

and Commager, *America: The Story of a Free People*, pp. 430-432.)

Marines continued to be stationed in Panama until 1914. There was no great Republican demand for congressional consultation or approval of these actions. The principle of limitation on Presidential authority in military affairs and in foreign affairs does not shine forth brilliantly in this cloudy record of Republican Presidents.

The constitutional case having been rejected, the case based on precedent found wanting, and the argument from principle without historical justification, it appears that what is really in progress here is a partisan attack on the office and powers of the President, an attempt to weaken the constitutional position of the Chief Executive for purely temporary, partisan objectives. There is a shocking similarity between the methods now being used and those which were used in the attack of the Republican Congress on President Andrew Johnson immediately after the Civil War. Then, as now, the purpose was to make the President dependent on Congress in a field of action which under the Constitution unquestionably belongs to the Chief Executive. Then, as now, the attempt was made in the form of rider. The Congress attached to the appropriation bill of 1867, a provision that all orders and instructions relating to military operations should be issued through the General of the Army; that the General should not be removed or assigned to command elsewhere than at Washington, without the express approval of the Senate—McLaughlin, *Constitutional History of the United States*, page 662. The effect was to make the General of the Army—Grant—Commander in Chief, and to make his removal from office solely dependent upon Senate approval.

This kind of partisan attack on the executive branch of the Government by the legislative branch is most serious. Its effect is to weaken the structure of the Constitution, to obscure and confuse the division of powers of the branches of Government. There is grave danger in the interference of the legislative branch in the sphere of the executive, especially in the field of foreign affairs and military action. The danger is to the legislative branch as well as to the executive branch.

To attempt to usurp the power of another branch of government may force the executive branch arbitrarily to exercise its proper functions. A free legislative body is always the principal bulwark between the people and an autocratic government. For such a body to act so as to destroy the respect with which it is held by the citizens is to perform a great disservice to democracy and representative government. Such irresponsible action sustains the judgment of Andrew McLaughlin, professor of history at Chicago University—

That democratic government is particularly endangered not so much by the intrigues of ambitious leaders hungry for power, as by legislative inefficiency, by interminable debates of which the people grow weary, by petty objections, and crafty obstruction, by blocs and factions, by party

Incoherence and consequent absence of assignable responsibility.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if this country is to survive, we are going to have to return to the doctrines and policies of the great founders of this Republic, such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, who said that our foreign policy should be that of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

I realize that any nationalist who subscribes to the doctrines of the great founders of this Republic is branded as an "isolationist." The wild-eyed internationalists who use that term do not seem to understand what it means to be a nationalist and subscribe to the doctrines of the great American statesmen of the past.

I was amused, indeed, to hear the two gentlemen a while ago quoting with approval the statement of former President Taft in favor of a policy of internationalism. I recall that Mr. Taft ran for reelection as President, and carried two States—Vermont and Utah. It has been said that he carried Vermont by default and Utah by discord. Vermont never had voted anything but the Republican ticket, and I am told that there was a local controversy going on in Utah at that time that so disturbed the public mind that they failed to go along with the drift of public opinion, and gave Mr. Taft a plurality of votes in that State, which gave him the electoral vote.

This internationalism is leading this country to destruction. We have just gone through the most useless war in history. Our boys won the fight on the battlefield, on the ocean, and in the air; but when General Patton marched with his victorious army up to Berlin, and the Germans ran up the white flag and beckoned him to come in and take control, he was ordered to move south, and the victory our boys had won was turned over to the worst enemy our Christian civilization has ever known.

This so-called United Nations, which I understand takes the credit for the firing of the commanding general in Korea, is out to destroy the Government of the United States, to wreck the American way of life, and to subordinate us to the domination of foreign powers, or foreign peoples, many of whom do not seem to have sense enough to govern their own countries.

They want to tell us when and where to go to war, although the countries they represent do not participate in those wars, except in a nominal way. They expect us to do the fighting, and then feed and clothe the peoples of the opposing countries, as well as the ones that pretended to be friendly with us, but did not choose to fight.

I have a petition on the Clerk's desk to bring out my resolution to withdraw from this so-called United Nations. I hope that every Member of the House signs it. In that way we can express the will of the American people, restore the Government of the United States to them, and put a stop to these aliens attempting to run our internal, as well as

our international affairs, and who seem to be bent on dragging us down to physical and financial bankruptcy, and thereby destroying the greatest Government the world has ever known.

One gentleman just stated that this so-called United Nations has a right to declare war for us. They have already declared one in Korea, and, without consulting the Congress of the United States, or the American people, the President sent our boys into what he called a "police action" in Korea, while the nations whose representatives voted to send our boys there, have complacently kept their forces at home.

As a result, we have lost between 60,000 and 100,000 men in Korea, in killed, wounded, missing, and frozen. In other words, we have lost more men in Korea already than we lost in four great wars—the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Spanish-American War, all combined.

Now, if we go on into China, the chances are that we will lose a million men, the very flower of American manhood, and probably finish the economic bankruptcy of the country. But in addition to that, this so-called United Nations wants us to send an army to Europe, ostensibly to fight a war that has never been declared. We have an army over there now, sent there to fight on the other side in a war that has cost us, according to recent reports, 1,300,000 casualties.

If we send another army to Europe and get into a war with Russia, and attempt to invade that country, we will probably bog down and become exhausted. That is exactly what our enemies want.

Right after the First World War, certain Englishmen in the House of Commons were criticizing David Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister, for not sending troops into Russia. He replied that any country could get into Russia with an army, but no country had ever been able to get out with one, and cited Napoleon's experience as an example.

That little group of Communists composed of a racial minority, now in control of Russia would not dare to attack this country if we would build the strongest air force on earth, with an ample supply of atomic bombs, with whatever naval facilities we may need, and develop a radar perimeter covering the Western Hemisphere. They know that if they ever got into a war with the United States under those conditions, it would not only mean the destruction of Moscow, Leningrad, and other great cities of Russia, but that the people whose parents and whose other relatives these communistic pirates have murdered, would rise up and chop off their yellow heads at the first opportunity. Yet, these Communist countries, headed by Russia, are in the United Nations and voting on those measures that interfere with the internal affairs of the United States.

This so-called United Nations recently passed a resolution to outlaw the alien land laws in the various States of this country. They are now trying to force

on us their "genocide" resolution, under which Americans who criticized members of a racial minority or probably a religious group, could be prosecuted for genocide. Prosecuted where? They could be sent to a foreign country and tried there for such an alleged offense.

Now, they are trying to interfere with our marriage laws, our school laws, our segregation laws, and other local laws in the various States. They are stirring race trouble from one end of this country to the other.

Remember that Russia, and all the other Communist countries in the United Nations, are voting for and supporting these crazy measures and resolutions to interfere with the internal affairs of the people of the various States of this Union.

The American people were never called upon to ratify this so-called United Nations. If they had been and had known what that group of internationalists were driving at, it would not have carried in a single State in this Union. If left to a vote of the people now and the facts brought home to them, the chances are that it would be repudiated in every State in this Union, and probably in every congressional district. Let us get out now, before it is too late. Let us build up our own defenses and strengthen our own country by building the strongest air force in the world, with an ample supply of atomic bombs, naval and radar facilities, sufficient to protect the Western Hemisphere.

Then we can lead the world by precept and example into a new day of peace and progress. But we can never do it by bribery at the expense of the overburdened taxpayers of this country, through any Marshall plan or other programs of international extravagance; nor can we drive them to it with the bayonet.

I agree with one statement which has been attributed to General MacArthur, and which, in my opinion, constitutes one of the most profound utterances that ever fell from the lips of a military leader, and that is that "You cannot bring peace with war."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

(Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. HERTER.)

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment now before us. For certain technical, but I think entirely valid reasons, the gentleman's amendment is limited entirely to troops which are sent to Europe under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Article 3, as you know, is the one in which the various parties to the treaty agreed to consult each other with respect to making mutual defense more effective. But article 3 can only be implemented by article 9 of the treaty under which a defense council is set up. The Defense Council has to recommend ways and means under which article 3 can be implemented. One of those recommendations has already been made,



and that is for a commander in chief of the unified forces.

When you talk about the constitutional prerogatives of the President of the United States in this situation I feel that you have a very close question. However, when he, as Commander in Chief, implements article 3 and puts these soldiers under a commander who is responsible to a council, only one of which is an American, an alien council, if you want to call it that, they are no longer under the Commander in Chief of the United States, and his constitutional prerogatives no longer apply. While General Eisenhower is the boss today, something might happen to him and it might be General Montgomery or Marshal Jouin or someone else tomorrow, and those men are no longer under the direct control of the President of the United States.

Another point of a technical nature is this: The question of implementing this treaty came up before us last July. We passed an act, and I have it here, Public Law 621, in which we made provision for sending arms to the various cooperating nations under the treaty. We gave permission to send United States matériel for the joint defenses; but it specifically states—and I hope every Member will read the first section of that act that we passed—it specifically states that that assistance is being given under article 9 of the treaty, which provides for the implementation of the treaty; in other words, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to sending matériel of war, inanimate things, it requires an act of Congress to do it; yet today we are talking about sending human beings, our boys, under exactly the same conditions, under exactly the same provisions of the treaty, and say it can be done without Congress being consulted. To me there is a complete incompatibility in that situation; and for that reason, because of the limitation that is imposed by this amendment which is very carefully drawn and applies only to article 3 of this treaty, I feel that this amendment is an entirely proper one. I do not want to handicap General Eisenhower in the defense of this Nation, but I think the President ought to come to us in the case of men, just as much as he has to in the case of matériel of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am for full military preparedness by this Nation. I favor America having the strongest ground, air, and sea forces that are required to insure the freedom and the safety of the American people.

But, while I am in favor of ample armament and adequately trained manpower, that does not mean that I am in favor of giving to one man, the President of the United States, the power to send American troops in any numbers he pleases anywhere and anytime he pleases.

No President, be he Democrat or Republican, should have the power to commit American Armed Forces all over the

world without the consent of Congress. And most certainly I do not think President Truman should have such powers when he, by his letter writing and removal of General MacArthur, has demonstrated himself to be an impulsive and impetuous man of quick temper and snap judgment.

I am, therefore, in favor of the Towe amendment, which would prohibit the President from sending American soldiers to Europe without first obtaining the consent of Congress to do so.

If President Truman today has the right and the power to send four divisions to Europe, he has the power to send eight divisions there. If he has the power to send eight divisions to Europe, he has the power to send 50 or 100 divisions.

These divisions which the President and Secretary Acheson propose to send to Europe are not being dispatched overseas to bolster up, to strengthen, or to protect the two American divisions we now have in Germany, as some would make you believe.

These new divisions which President Truman proposes to send to Europe are being committed there by the President to become part and parcel of an international army. This international army will be composed, it is claimed, of the troops of 14 Atlantic Pact nations, altogether, including our own.

For the present, this international army to which President Truman and Dean Acheson would commit our American troops will be under the command of an American general, Ike Eisenhower.

Next week, next month, or next year, however, these 14 Atlantic Pact nations, of which we are only 1, may elect to put a foreign general in charge of this international army. Then our American soldiers will be under the command of a foreign general and this foreign general, not an American commander, will determine where and when our American troops shall be committed to battle.

I am not saying that the United States of America should never, under any circumstances, commit American soldiers, to become part of an international army. What I am saying is that the decision as to whether or not we commit our American soldiers to foreign soil as part of an international army should be made by the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 96 Senators and not by one man, the President of the United States, no matter who he may be. This is too much power to entrust to any one man and especially too much power for an individual so impulsive, impetuous, and quick-tempered as President Truman, on many occasions, has demonstrated himself to be.

It is the primary responsibility of the nations of Europe and not of the United States to defend Europe. We Americans want to help them. But before America commits more troops to Europe this Congress ought to have the right to inquire of these other nations what they are going to do to help defend themselves.

I do not want to see, in Europe, another Korea where our Nation, fighting under a United Nations banner, puts up

95 percent of the troops and 100 percent of the cost of the police action or war or whatever you please to call it.

Furthermore, before this Congress ever votes troops for Europe, it ought to first have the assurance of our European allies, if they are going to be allies, that they will cease this unholy trade they have been carrying on, for several years now, with Russia and her satellites.

Do you know that in 1949, the three nations of Great Britain, France, and Belgium sold more than \$1,000,000,000 worth of goods to the enemy countries behind the iron curtain?

Of that more than \$1,000,000,000 worth of goods that was shipped in 1949 from Great Britain, France, and Belgium to Russia and her satellites more than \$200,000,000 of it consisted of such potential war materials as iron, steel, rubber, tin, copper, brass, ball bearings, machine tools, automobiles, trucks, and barbed wire. The unholy business of our allies shipping war goods to Russia, to China, and to other Communist satellite nations still continues.

Congress ought to inquire into these things before the United States commits more American troops to fight on foreign soil as part of an international army.

The country will feel much safer if we today pass the Towe amendment and thereby let the American people know that Congress no longer is going to permit one man, the President, to send American troops anytime, anywhere, and in any numbers he pleases to become part of an international army.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this limited time is inadequate to make even a small contribution to this very important discussion. But I am not too distressed about that for what has gone before in the debate has been largely excellent, particularly the very fine and scholarly remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I hope you will reexamine his speech tomorrow morning, because it is an excellent exposition of this whole subject.

I must pass over the deplorable lack of wisdom in not always voluntarily consulting the Congress and the American people in policies of this kind and to refer to once again, and emphasize a little more the very clear provisions of the Constitution in this matter. When the framers of the Constitution met in convention in Philadelphia they had as one of their foremost problems that of getting away from one-man rule, and they were not going to make a mistake about this language. When it came to the military powers of Congress they set them forth in detail:

Article I, section 8, dealing with legislative powers, provides in part that—

Congress shall have the power—to declare war—to make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies—to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections

and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

I have referred to these powers in detail to indicate the painstaking care used by the Constitutional Convention to make sure that the high responsibility of raising, and regulating the use of armies, was exclusively vested in the Congress, hence, by representation, in the people.

In addition, Congress had complete control of our money, without which no troops can be sent anywhere.

In contradistinction to those broad and detailed powers, article II, section 2, briefly provides that—

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States.

This is the only reference to such powers. Can we infer from this a power to start and maintain a major war, as in Asia?

Those who support the President's powers rather glibly refer to a large number of precedents and Supreme Court opinions. They do not bear careful analysis. It is of course true that from 1798 on, marines and limited forces have been dispatched to protect American lives or property, usually as a result of a civil war or internal disturbance which could not be controlled by the local government. Such temporary emergencies are hardly to be compared with a permanent policy of occupying Europe with large numbers, for long years; or with fighting in Korea the fourth worst war in our history, with 250,000 troops, 60,000 casualties and 15,000 monthly replacements; a war in its ninth month, now involving us with the most numerous nation on earth; a tragic war in which the end is not in sight.

While I am satisfied, as a lawyer, that the President is without constitutional right to fight all over Asia, or to occupy Europe, without congressional sanction, it is even more important that he should not attempt to involve the Nation in such vast projects without an assurance of the people's will, and the backing of its representatives. Obviously he must come to Congress to implement his actions. How much wiser to obtain their approval in advance.

You do not avoid war by omitting a formal declaration of war. We are presently engaged in a major war which may suddenly or by degrees become a world war. To suggest that such a course may be pursued without action by Congress is to reduce its authority, and hence the authority of the people, to a debating society, with some limited function of approving the appropriation of money demanded by the President. To so limit the Congress and exalt the Presidency is, of course, to abandon democracy and surrender to a dictatorship.

On January 15, Senator TAFT said:

The basic liberties of the people . . . are imperiled unless we can retain in Congress the right to pass on policies affecting—

Their—

very life and being.

I agree. I am not prepared to surrender in whole or in part the power of the people exercised by their elective representatives.

Neither am I prepared to deliver the fate of this country solely into the hands of President Truman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVey].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to imagine anything more directly related to a bill for raising an army than a provision stating where that army is to serve. In the autumn of 1940 the Congress passed the first peacetime conscription. That plan for conscription contained the provision that the men to be drafted were not to be sent out of the Western Hemisphere except to our own Territories and possessions. A restriction on the deployment of the men under arms was germane to the conscription law of 1940.

Another factor which entered into that situation was that wherever our soldiers went they would be serving under American officers, responsible to our American Government. No such safeguards exist today. If our boys are sent abroad, they will be soldiers of an international army, and under a commander that is responsible not to the United States but to an international union in which our Government has but one vote. That army will have its own code of military law which may be at great variance with our manner of doing things.

Certainly, if there ever were a time when we were justified in placing a limitation on the manner in which our troops shall be deployed, it is now. We do not even know how long an American commander will be leading these troops, but we do know that they will be part of an international army, and that a dozen other governments will be exercising control over them. After the shameful way in which other nations have failed us in the Korean crisis, where the blood of our American youth by the thousands is being spilled, we shall betray our trust and be remiss in our duty to our country if we fail to retain the authority for the disposition of our troops in the Congress, where by constitutional mandate the power to declare war rests.

Oh, I know there have been cited 134 examples of the use of such power on the part of the Chief Executive since the founding of this Nation. But have you examined these citations.

They include the following:

One. The dispatch of five marines to Cuba to bury one of their comrades who died of fever.

Two. Six sailors from the battleship *Tennessee* who were sent to Paris to guard our exhibit in the Paris exhibition.

Three. Admiral Perry had an honor guard of 300 bluejackets when he went to China.

There were many others in that list of 134 citations which were of no greater significance. I submit to you there is a vast difference between such examples of the exercise of authority on the part of an executive, and a police action in Korea where casualties have reached approximately 60,000, and where we now have 200,000 troops committed to battle.

The issue before us today is not confined only to the deployment of troops; it involves the issue of peace and war. If we agree to permit the present incumbent of the White House to exercise his will in the use of our troops, we shall have abdicated the authority to declare war as vested in this body by the Constitution of the United States. If you do not believe this, look at what has happened in Korea. Are we at war there? Did the Congress declare that war?

Every day the postman brings letters asking us the question, "When are we going to bring our boys home from Korea?" and a Congressman must admit he does not know. The best he can say is, I did not send our boys to Korea. This is the President's war, and we are expected to keep hands off. The President did not consult the Congress before he entered into war in Korea, and we shall be violating the trust imposed upon us by the Constitution should we permit the Chief Executive to continue to send our troops to any part of the world without our consent. If we here decide upon this course of action, we place in the hands of the President the power to make war in any theater of the globe, and we abdicate the authority plainly vested in us by the Constitution.

We stand today on the threshold of new action. Where will that action lead us? Speaking for myself, I want the authority to make war to remain in the control of the Congress. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to embrace any other course, for I still have the haunting memories of what happened in June 1950, when our troops were ordered to Korea without the approval of the Congress. That step has led us into a situation fraught with the gravest danger. No one dares predict what the outcome will be. I do not want a repetition of episodes of that nature.

There are no precedents in our history for such action on the part of our Chief Executive. There is a vast difference between the dispatch of 90 marines to Nicaragua and 200,000 troops to Korea. To say there are 134 previous examples of this latter action is to laugh, were there not such grave implications connected with it.

In this situation I speak only for myself and with the future welfare of my country at heart. My convictions, nevertheless, are strong. The Congress has already abdicated too much of its authority, in my opinion. Let us hold the line at this point and prove that this body still possesses the virility which our founding fathers expected of us when they entrusted us with the defense of our country and the power to make war should necessity impose that burden upon us.



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, having lived fairly actively with this question for the last 6 or 8 months I cannot say all I would like to say in this short time. Suffice it to state, however, that I am here in support of this resolution in spite of the fact I think it is unnecessarily limited in scope. For my part I should like a general resolution clearly defining the limitations upon the power of the President to send troops abroad without the consent of Congress and not limited to the Atlantic Pact.

Briefly, there is no precedent in the books to justify the position taken by this President as to his unlimited power. His position is unique and wholly without precedent. Even such strong Presidents as Jackson, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt did not go as far as that and none of them were sissies in dealing with the Congress or construing their power as the constitutional Commander in Chief or as President.

Let me quote the gentleman who preceded the present incumbent in the White House, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1940 telegraphing the President of the dying French Government in answer to a request from the French for military support, Franklin D. Roosevelt at the close of his message of utmost sympathy stated:

These statements carry no implication of military commitment. Only Congress can make such commitments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope we can adopt this amendment and start limiting the President's claimed power.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, the language of this amendment is not, in my opinion, satisfactory, but I am wholeheartedly in support of the idea of some degree of congressional responsibility over the sending of American troops to Europe. We are now engaged under article III in building up strength among the members of the North Atlantic Treaty powers. At the most at the end of this year they are going to have less than 18 divisions under arms according to their present plans—not nearly enough to suppress any aggression by the Russians. The United States is going to have, according to the President, six divisions in Europe. We are going to be providing most of the equipment for these North Atlantic Pact nations. We are going to be providing most of the air and naval units. I think if the Congress can get some control over the program we may get some order out of this and if we make our aid proportionate to the efforts of the Europeans we will make far greater progress than we now are. If we proceed under the present plans and the Europeans go ahead as slowly as they are now going, it will be 1953 or 1954 before we have the 60 or 70 divisions that are considered necessary and essential to deter the Russians from attacking. If we can get some

degree of control over this program, if we can make our aid proportionate to the efforts of the Europeans, we can force them to make greater sacrifices and perhaps by the end of 1952 we will have sufficient divisions in Europe to deter the Russians from attacking, and if they should attack to prevent their sweeping over Western Europe. I think the Congress should have some responsibility over this. I think this is a most serious problem, and I think the Congress should exert some control; otherwise, it will be 1953 and the job will not be done and Western Europe will be vulnerable to attacks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any of this short time of 5 minutes to go into the constitutional question as to the rights of the President. We all know what the Constitution says as to his power as Commander in Chief of the Army.

But I want to say this, and I want everybody to understand it, and I want to show you the fallacy of this amendment. To whom does it apply? It applies to inductees under this bill. It applies to the boys that will be drafted under this bill; there is no dispute about that. It says that any boy that is drafted under this bill cannot be sent to Europe unless Congress passes a concurrent resolution. Now, just think what an absurd situation we will find ourselves in. It permits the President to send 20 National Guard divisions over to Europe. It permits the President to send 800,000 reservists that are called back to active duty over to Europe. It permits the President to send every volunteer in the Army, or who comes into the Army, over to Europe. Now, is that not an absurd situation for this great body of the Congress of the United States to find itself in? It says that a handful of drafted men cannot be sent overseas until Congress passes a resolution, but as to the great bulk of the National Guard, the reservists and the volunteers, the President has the authority to send them over. That is how absurd you are in this position.

As I said, when the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] presented this amendment, the straight and the forward way to deal with it is to take up the resolution sent here by the Senate. This is a military question as to who goes to Europe.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Acheson.

Mr. VINSON. No; it is not Acheson either. It is a military question; and yet the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said that a military question should be decided by military men and not by civilians. Of course, he just meets himself coming back right there and that is the trouble with this kind of argument that is being made here today. You are just arguing in circles. I want to say to you, do not do anything that is ridiculous. We say in this bill that the man that is drafted cannot go to Europe, the President

cannot send him, but he has the right to send all the volunteers, all the reservists, and all the National Guard units, and that we impose no objection to the President doing that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TOWE) there were—ayes 129, noes 138.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TOWE and Mr. KILDAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 168, noes 192.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, under the measure now before the House, for the first time in our history American men will be conscripted to fight an undeclared war, be ordered into battle, under a commanding officer who receives his orders and directives, not from the Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces, but from an organization made up of the representatives of foreign nations, at least one of whom represents our enemy—is a member of the organization carrying on the war.

Our men will go forward into battle, not under the Stars and Stripes, but under the flag of the United Nations, which will be put over all flags flying at the headquarters of the supreme commander.

For the first time in our history, American youth—enlisted and conscripted—are to become mercenary soldiers, paid not by those for whom they are fighting, but by our own people, who in the opinion of many of us have no stake in this war.

General MacArthur, the implacable foe of the Communists seeking foothold in Japan; who has done so much to establish peace there, cement our friendship with the Japanese people and who wanted from the President a definite answer as to our objectives in the Far East, has been fired.

Because of his intense Americanism, his refusal to be gagged, he joins Billy Mitchell, Admiral Denfeld, and Captain Crommelin, who were removed because they failed to accept the views of politically minded superiors; insisted upon giving expression to their opinions as to the manner in which the safety of the Republic could best be guarded.

General MacArthur has failed to obtain the answer which so many men serving in Korea, so many wives and mothers here at home, have been seeking from their representatives in Congress.

The President has chosen to refuse to follow the advice of General MacArthur,

whom last night he characterized in the following words:

General MacArthur's place in history as one of our greatest commanders is fully established.

The President evidently prefers the policy of an Acheson, who followed the Hiss line and who, in the opinion of many, is overly sympathetic toward the Communists; is too intent on protecting British, rather than American, interests.

The firing of MacArthur will detract from, rather than lend support to, the conscripting of American youth to fight under a supreme commander who receives his orders from the United Nations; over whose headquarters there flies—not the Stars and Stripes—but the flag of United Nations.

Discussion of the bill now before us will be made tomorrow if time can be obtained.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### THE CONSTITUTION STILL STANDS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I find myself appalled by the attitude displayed on this floor and elsewhere following announcement of the relief of General MacArthur from command.

If there is one tradition in the United States which has been maintained by constitutional provision and statutory safeguard it is the absolute supremacy of the responsible elected officials of this country over the military.

About this there is no room for a division of opinion. It is a fact which no reasonable person can deny or doubt.

The history of the formation of the Constitution makes it clear that an intelligent and well-founded fear of military dictatorship, or even of military domination, was responsible for many of the safeguards in the Constitution such as establishing the President as the Commander in Chief of the armed serv-

ices, discouraging but not quite prohibiting a standing army, authorizing a militia, and specifying the ultimate control of all public policy in responsible political officers.

#### CIVILIANS MAKE POLICY

By law, by custom, and by demand of the American people, national policy is made by civilians—by the President and the Members of Congress. The function of military commanders is to execute policy; there is no compulsion upon the civilian authorities even to consult the military.

A nice distinction can be made between military efficiency and militaristic inefficiency.

It is axiomatic that military aims are directed at the accomplishment of an objective set by civilian policy through maximum efficiency and economy of men and matériel. Making war efficiently is the prime function of military aims.

Militarism is the opposite; a Russian grand duke of the militaristic caste once remarked that wars spoil armies. Militarism has as its chief aim the creation of a military caste of special privileges, large expenditures, gaudy display, capable only of feeble exertions in war.

#### PUBLIC POLICY AT ISSUE

I would rather sidestep the question of personality flaws in a military figure whose tactical soundness, even brilliance, assures him a secure place in American history, and confine myself to a discussion of the public policy which is at issue.

Whatever the motivation, and regardless of impassioned oratory by partisans of General MacArthur, the plain fact is that repeatedly during the last 2 years General MacArthur has attempted to arrogate to himself policy-making powers which were never his.

At almost any given date since the 1948 Presidential campaign opened President Truman would have been more than justified, on the record, in relieving General MacArthur of all command duties and of ordering his involuntary retirement from active duty.

#### MAC ARTHUR WOULD NOT TOLERATE DISSENT

It is a notable tribute to the patience of a President not renowned for his forbearance that President Truman has, time after time, allowed General MacArthur to get away with breaches of propriety which General MacArthur would never have tolerated in a subordinate of his own.

It is a matter of record that Gen. Douglas MacArthur was a member of the glittering court-martial which broke General Billy Mitchell and almost ended our military air arm before it could get well started.

The record of vote of that court is, by law, secret; there is nothing to show that General MacArthur cast a dissenting vote; there is nothing to show that there was a dissenting vote.

As Chief of Staff, General Douglas MacArthur was a brilliant commander who brooked no interference and made his Secretary of War little more than a figurehead.

#### A FINAL STRAW

Year after year MacArthur has been forgiven his apparent disregard of orders and directives from his superiors, because of his flashing brilliance as a genuine military leader and strategist.

Since his elevation as SCAP there has been less opportunity for the exercise of his military gifts, and increasingly his actions have carried him into indiscretions which have imperiled world peace and the orderly procedure of public business on an international scale.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REDDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### REREFERENCE OF EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NO. 357

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of Executive Communication No. 357 and that the communication be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### TROOPS TO EUROPE

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the House should have approved the amendment to require congressional approval of the President's proposal to send troops to Europe. The action of the House is to me a tragic abdication of congressional authority, and one that will affect the destiny of this Republic if it is not corrected.

#### KOREA AND THE U. N. CHARTER

As we know, the President sent American troops to Korea as a part of a United Nations international force hastily created to assist South Korea. He said he did so under the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The United States became a member of the United Nations by action of the Senate of the United States. One provision of the United Nations Charter provides for an agreement among members for the establishment of an international military force. This same provision also states that any such agreement must be ratified by the constitutional process of each member nation—in our case ratification by the Senate. No such agreement ever was made or ratified. It was, therefore, clearly a violation of this procedure when the President last July sent American troops to Korea under the name of a United Nations police force. That breach of the charter and of the Constitution was not debated at length, because the President's action



had committed American men to grave danger, and the only possible course of action for Congress was to support those men to the fullest extent of our means. That we have done and will continue to do.

#### THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

The same question arose, however, when the President announced he would send American troops to Europe—as a part of a North Atlantic international army. The North Atlantic Pact is a military alliance ratified by Congress. Under the pact, 17 nations agree to coordinate “the exercise of the right of self-defense specifically recognized in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.” The President stated in January that he had authority to send four divisions to Europe now, and more later if he desired, to implement the North Atlantic Pact. His administrative aids submitted a brief in support of his position, claiming that the constitutional power of Congress over the military, and to declare war, are outmoded. Certain Senators challenged the President's authority and the debate began.

Months ago, when the North Atlantic Treaty was being debated in the Senate, many Members suggested that specific language be written into it, stating that there should be no assignment of troops overseas, without the consent of Congress. These Senators were assured, unequivocally and definitely, by the Secretary of State, by Chairman CONNALLY of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and by other supporters of the pact, that nothing in it obligated America to commit troops anywhere and that every action taken under the pact would first be submitted to the Congress. Senator CONNALLY was especially definite in the promise that Congress would retain constitutional control. It was with this understanding, and only because of these assurances, that many Senators voted for the treaty.

Shortly after the pact was ratified, the President decided it would be wise to implement it by furnishing money and ammunition to the member nations. In accordance with assurances given during debate, he submitted his proposal to Congress. It was debated at length, and Congress passed the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, which is still in effect, and under which we have sent several billion dollars worth of military supplies to our North Atlantic allies.

#### STRANGE CHANGE IN POLICY

This was as it should be in our Republic. But when the President proposed to go further and to send troops along with the supplies, he said it was his intention to do so without consulting the Congress.

Why is it that the assurances given when the pact was ratified are forgotten now?

Why is it that sending men to Europe does not require the consent of Congress, but such consent is required for guns?

Has the Atlantic Pact been altered—or the United Nations Charter—or the Constitution of the United States?

In 1945 the President wrote a letter to Congress regarding the use of troops un-

der the United Nations Charter. His letter, from Potsdam, was part of the effort to get Senate acceptance of the Charter, and he said that “when any such agreement or agreements are negotiated, it will be my purpose to ask Congress for appropriate legislation to approve them.” Why has he changed his position?

These questions have been left unanswered by the resolution adopted recently in the other body.

I hope that you agree that these questions must be answered. The constitutional issue is clear, as expressed recently by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] who said:

The President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and as such is authorized to direct the movement of land, naval, and Air Forces placed by law at his command and employ them in the manner he may deem most effectual. But it must be emphasized that Congress has sole power to raise and support armies and to maintain and provide for them. The Congress makes the laws relative to war. The President enforces them \* \* \*. The power of the President, acting as Commander in Chief, must be exercised according to law. \* \* \*. The above-stated principles are not figments of the imagination but specific provisions of the Constitution and judicial interpretations thereof. Therefore, I am of the view that the question of sending troops to Europe should be presented to and determined by Congress.

Whether or not one approves sending troops to Europe is not the basic issue. The basic issue remains—whether we shall abide by or abandon our constitutional procedure.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] is recognized.

TRUMAN'S DISCHARGE OF MACARTHUR BRINGS US NEARER TO WORLD WAR III.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Truman's appeasement of Red China by firing General MacArthur brings us nearer to world war III.

The strengthening of MacArthur's hand in Asia as he requested would have been the best insurance against all-out war. Dictators strike at weakness, never at strength. MacArthur represented strength.

Truman's act is a sell-out to the spineless policy of the British Foreign Office that today recommended turning over Formosa to the Chinese Reds and also that the Chinese Reds participate in the Japanese peace treaty. The British Foreign Office has a long record of appeasement. Outstanding in that record is the British appeasement at Munich that brought on World War II. History is repeating itself. Secretary of State Acheson in advising the President to discharge MacArthur is the unholy instrument of that policy of appeasement. If Truman continues to be dominated by the British Socialist Government, the Kremlin would have an easy time in taking over the United States.

This administration and its chief advisers simply do not understand Communist aggression. The history of the postwar years proves that beyond a doubt. One of the American leaders who does understand Communist ag-

gression and has demonstrated that he knows how to deal with it was Douglas MacArthur. Truman removed one of America's best defenders when he removed MacArthur. Truman and Acheson will have to make a terrible account to the American people.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from Newsweek.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a press release from the White House on the relief of General MacArthur.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news article.

Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on three subjects.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Gen. Carl Gray on the deplorable situation in the medical stations of the veterans' hospitals.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. DOLLINGER) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in eight instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short article.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$205.

Mr. REGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Mr. Norman L. Casner, Jr., of El Paso, Tex.

Mr. BATTLE, Mr. NORBLAD, Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Minneapolis Tribune relative to the damage created last year by rust.

Mr. VELDE, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. GWINN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each instance include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York and Mr. PATTERSON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 1951, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

378. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of February 1951, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2416. A bill relating to exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness; with amendment (Rept. No. 311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3168. A bill to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion; with amendment (Rept. No. 312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2654. A bill to amend section 10 of Public Law 378, Eighty-first Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2924. A bill to amend section 4164 of

title 18, United States Code, relating to conditional release of Federal prisoners; with amendment (Rept. No. 314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 3654. A bill to establish the Office of Federal Minerals Coordinator; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 3655. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Council Bluffs, Iowa, a post office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3656. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the broadcasting and televising of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 3657. A bill to provide that certain vessels shall be subject to the laws and regulations relating to the inspection, safety, and navigation of steam vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3658. A bill to amend the act of March 28, 1951, to clarify the naturalization status of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution to create a joint committee to make a continuing study of interstate gambling activities and whether interstate facilities are being utilized for the development of corrupting influences in violation of law; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution providing for an invitation to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to address a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Res. 190. Resolution requesting that General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur return to the United States to report on the progress of the Korean situation at a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to deport criminals who are aliens or naturalized by fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act with enforcement provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to eliminate the income tax on profits from the sale of homes when occupied by their owners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance, or socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the

President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a Federal building in the city of Lawrence; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to retaining local offices of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, prohibiting a person from being elected President of the United States more than twice, and further prohibiting a person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President, from being elected to the office more than once; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 3659. A bill for the relief of Ambrogio Grassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 3660. A bill for the relief of Herbert Jegerst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3661. A bill for the relief of Demosthenes C. Hadjiyannakis and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3662. A bill for the relief of John A. Spartacos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3663. A bill for the relief of the Inland Petroleum Transportation Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3664. A bill for the relief of Aba Szejnbejm, Mrs. Dvora Szejnbejm, Shlomo Szejnbejm, and Daniel Szejnbejm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 3665. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Katharina Metz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 3666. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3667. A bill for the relief of Rashid Cassis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3668. A bill for the relief of David Yeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

207. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution entitled "Resolution requesting Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to work for an extension of time in relation to the filing of World War II prisoners of war, civilian internees and survivor claims, under the War Claims Act of 1948, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, and approved by the Acting Governor on April 5, 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

208. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to enact a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act with enforcement provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

209. Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States



in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance, or socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

210. Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a Federal building in the city of Lawrence; to the Committee on Public Works.

211. Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to eliminate the income tax on profits from the sale of homes when occupied by their owners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

212. By Mr. HOPE: Resolution of Rev. W. W. Bunch and the Congregation of the First Baptist Church of Syracuse, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation to divert grain and fruit now used for the manufacture of liquor and malt beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

213. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert F. Milligan, clerk, Mount Prospect, Ill., relative to tax exemption on municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

214. Also, petition of G. B. Folds, president, West Monroe Lions Club, West Monroe, La., relative to urging and requesting the United States Senate to continue the Fulbright and Kefauver committees, and that a permanent crime investigating committee be established in the immediate future; to the Committee on Rules.

215. Also, petition of Fred J. Hannan, adjutant, Col. Samuel D. Foster Chapter No. 76, DAV, Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to being placed on record as in favor of a 17-percent annual pay increase for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

216. Also, petition of Clarence A. Bruner, secretary, Swabian Beneficial Society, Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to being placed on record as in favor of a 17-percent annual pay increase for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

217. Also, petition of Otto C. Debes, secretary, the Allegheny Social Club, Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to being placed on record as in favor of a 17-percent annual pay increase for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

218. Also, petition of Neal Hanley, secretary, National Maritime Union of America, New York, N. Y., relative to requesting action on the pending bills H. R. 3017 and S. 872, which would provide grain for the people of India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

219. Also, petition of M. David Weiss, National Jewish Youth Conference, New York, N. Y., relative to requesting that the United States Government do everything in its power to check the resurgence of nazism in Germany, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven and in the earth, in the resurrection glory of the world about us, heaven and earth are full of Thee; common bushes are on fire with God and the time for the sing-

ing of birds has come. May a spiritual springtime make our own hearts as the garden of the Lord. There may the fair flowers of humility and charity appear; there may desert ground blossom as the rose and barren branches be clothed upon with the beauty of holiness. May our own attitudes contribute to the warmth of that climate of friendship which shall at last color every landscape with its magic charm and spread its divine tints under all skies across all the areas of human life. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 11, 1951, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 599. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.;

H. R. 1249. An act for the relief of the La Fayette Brewery, Inc.;

H. R. 1479. An act for the relief of Joseph Bernstein;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces; and

H. R. 3040. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Ogden, Utah, to the Ogden Chamber of Commerce.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1951, RELATING TO RFC

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, on the unfinished business, Senate Resolution 79, a division of time is now in effect. However, I ask unanimous consent that meanwhile, before the consideration of the resolution begins, Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, and introduce bills and resolutions, and transact other routine business without debate, and that the time thus consumed be not charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. We are now operating under a division of time on the

pending resolution. I should like to inquire whether the time has been allocated and is controlled by any Senators. If not, should it not be done?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes; I think it should be done.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I had planned to call up the resolution and to speak briefly on it. I think the time of the proponents should be controlled by the author of the resolution, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and that the time of the opponents should be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. However, until the senior Senator from Arkansas comes to the floor, I suggest that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be in control of the time of the opponents.

Mr. MCFARLAND. That would be perfectly agreeable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make another suggestion. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is not on the floor. I wonder if in his absence the junior Senator from Nebraska could act for him in controlling the time of the proponents.

Mr. MCFARLAND. That would be agreeable at any time that the Senator from Indiana is not on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the time for debate will be divided equally and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], with such substitution for them, in the event of their absence, as has been suggested.

### MARYLAND SENATORIAL ELECTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from former Senator Millard E. Tydings, of Maryland, filing formally with the Senate a written complaint, with additional statement attached, concerning alleged violations of law and undesirable practices followed by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland, and those acting in his behalf in the recent Maryland senatorial election, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED REVISION OF A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed revision of a supplemental appropriation, involving an increase of \$300,000, Department of Justice, fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of \$50,000,000, Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying paper);